TWO

REPORTS

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

Local Taxation of the City of

DUBLIN.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
16 *May* and 9 *July* 1823.

---

356. & 549. A

BIBL.
LONDIN.
IV.

THE FIRST REPORT - - - (Pipe Water and Metal Main) - p. 3
THE SECOND REPORT - - - (Minutes of Evidence) - - p. 5

FIRST

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the LOCAL TAXATION of the City of DUBLIN, and to report their Opinion and Observations thereon, from time to time, to The House; and to whom the PETITIONS of the Inhabitants of several Parishes of the City of Dublin, complaining thereof, were referred;——HAVE agreed to the following RESOLUTIONS:

Resolved,

THAT it is the Opinion of this Committee, That it is inexpedient to examine Witnesses respecting the Pipe Water and Metal Main Taxes; as it appears, by the Reports of the Commissioners for auditing Public Accounts, that continued Misapplications of Public Money are considered, by the Commissioners, to have occurred; and as the whole subject is fully set forth on the face of their Reports.

Resolved,

THAT it is necessary, on the part of the Public, that immediate Proceedings should be taken, at Law, for the purpose of bringing this matter to a close, and ascertaining what Sums remained due on the foot of those Accounts; and what right, or title, the Corporation possess in the Pipe Water Estates.

16 May 1823.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/reportfromselect0000grea_p5r8

SECOND

REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

Local Taxation of the City of DUBLIN:

VIZ.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

◆

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
9 *July* 1823.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 7

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - - ib.

Mr. Richard Purdy p. 7, 68, 144
Mr. John M'Mullen - - p. 26
Mr. I. Stewart p. 59, 151, 170, 231
Sir Robert Shaw - - - p. 67
Rev. Peers Robert Gamble p. 69
William Harty, M.D. - p. 95, 103
Mr. Samuel Wray - - p. 127
Mr. Molesworth Greene - p. 129
Mr. Michael Cullen - p. 136, 175
Mr. Michael Maley - - p. 136
Mr. Andrew Coffey - - p. 147
Mr. John Peters - - - p. 147
Mr. Timothy Allen - - p. 176
Mr. Richard Oulton - p. 183, 197
Mr. George Nugent - - p. 195
Major James Palmer p. 198, 218
Mr. Alexander Tulloch - p. 209
J. Claudius Beresford Esq. p. 211
John Crosbie Graves, Esq. p. 222
Thos. Spring Rice, Esq. M.P. p. 242
Thomas Ellis, Esq. M.P. - p. 249

THE APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 255

SECOND

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the LOCAL TAXATION of the City of DUBLIN, and to report their Opinion and Observations thereon, from time to time, to The House; and to whom the PETITIONS of the Inhabitants of several Parishes of the City of Dublin, complaining thereof, were referred;—HAVE, pursuant to the Order of The House, further examined the matters to them referred, and have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE Subject referred to Your Committee, is in its nature so important, and so complicated, that it has produced the necessity of examining Witnesses at great length, and of calling for very voluminous documentary Evidence. At the present late period of the Session, Your Committee are only prepared to report the Evidence taken before them, trusting early in the ensuing Session to be enabled to resume the consideration of the subject; having no doubt that they shall be able to submit to The House, such a final Report as may lead to results highly advantageous to the Public.

9 July 1823.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Lunæ, 28° *die Aprilis,* 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Richard Purdy, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Purdy.
(28 April.)

WHERE do you reside?—In Dublin.

What is your business?—I am a merchant.

Are you a member of the Chamber of Commerce at Dublin?—I am.

What situation do you hold in the Chamber of Commerce?—I am one of the council of twenty-one.

How long have you resided in Dublin?—About twenty years, and have paid taxes ten years.

Have you paid any attention to the local taxation of the city of Dublin?—I have paid a good deal of attention to it, since I was intrusted by the parish of St. Mary, for the purpose of inquiring into it.

Have you turned your attention to that branch of the local taxes, which is levied under the authority of the grand juries?—I have; but other branches of the local taxation have had more attention from me.

It having appeared, by returns laid before Parliament, that the grand jury taxes of the city of Dublin have very much increased, can you inform the Committee of any causes to which that increase may be attributed?—A considerable part of the increase may be attributed to the Act of 1808, which extended the jurisdiction of the recorder to those parts of the city not within the ancient city of Dublin; and it may, in part, be attributed to large sums having been expended for the building and support of Richmond bridewell.

Mr. *Richard Purdy.* (28 April.)

Under the Police Act?—Yes.

Are there any other causes?—It has been greatly increased by mis-management of the funds; by improvident contracts, made by various grand juries; by extravagant salaries and allowances to various persons, for alleged services at the prisons and at the sessions court; by an injudicious mode of collection, which affords to fraudulent collectors many means to act unjustly towards individuals, particularly the lower classes; and by the absence of a proper control over the funds on the part of the inhabitants.

Can you state to the Committee, any of the improvident contracts to which you have alluded?—I particularly allude to one for potatoes.

Can you give the Committee some information on that subject?—It was a contract for the supply of the prisoners with potatoes, at 6*l.* per ton.

For what gaol?—Richmond bridewell and Newgate.

At what time was that contract made?—In 1822.

Are you aware, what was the usual market price of potatoes, in Dublin, at the time that contract was entered into?—I cannot speak as to the price at the time the contract was made, but a short time after, I purchased largely of potatoes for America, and shipped at 3*l.* to 3*l.* 10*s.* per ton.

You have stated, that some portion of the increase of the grand jury taxes, is to be attributed to the salaries paid to the public officers, what do you allude to?—I refer to the salaries and fees generally; they have been considerably increased within the last twenty years.

What was the amount of presentments for the clerks of the crown and clerks of the peace, in 1781?—115*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

What was the amount in 1790?—651*l.* 12*s.* 3*d.*

In 1801?—693*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.*

In 1811?—1,278*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*

In 1821?—1,715*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.*

Will you have the goodness to state, what was the amount of the presentments made on account of the sheriffs and coroners, in the year 1790?—6*l.*

In 1801?—65*l.* 16*s.* 4*d.*

In 1811?—153*l.* 4*s.*

In 1821?—448*l.* 16*s.* 10*d.*

What was the presentment made for the secretary to the grand jury, in the year 1790?—40*l.* 0*s.* 3*d.*

In 1801?—50*l.*

In 1811?—350*l.*

And in 1821?—The same.

What is the increase in the salaries of the chaplains, since the year 1790?—In 1790, the salaries were 60*l.*; in 1821, 330*l.*

What are the defects in the mode of collection to which you alluded, as being one cause of the augmented expense?—The collectors are not accountable to the churchwardens; they collect from the parishioners, and make the returns to the grand jury; the churchwardens have no control over those returns on the collections; and we have ascertained, that many frauds have been committed by collectors, in making those returns, one of which has come within my own knowledge.

Can you state it to the Committee?—A person of the name of Welsh, on the the City Quay, complained to me, that she had paid the sum of 3*l.* to the collector of the grand jury cess; this collector in consequence of having committed some frauds, or being deficient in his accounts, lost his situation, and she has been applied to again for the payment of the same money; the collector had not returned receipt of this money to the treasurer of the grand jury cess, to whom I applied on the subject; he said he would investigate the matter, he referred to the present collector; the collector could not give the poor woman any redress; and I then applied by memorial to the present grand jury, and have not yet obtained any reply.

You have stated, that a considerable portion of the increase of the grand jury taxes, is attributable to the extension of the powers of the recorder to those parts of the county of Dublin, which are brought within his jurisdiction by the Police Act; have you any suggestion to make with regard to that?—I am of opinion, that the most effectual remedy would be, to deprive the grand jury of the power to tax the citizens; that the citizens in their several parishes, and the vestries should elect persons properly qualified, to form a board of commissioners, to whom should be committed the control of such levy as may be necessary for this and other local purposes; and that those parts of the city not within the ancient city, should be

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(28 April.)

parties to such arrangement: also, that all criminals found guilty of transportable offences, should be transferred upon conviction, from the city prison to the penitentiary, and be there supported at the expense of government. That the expensive establishments at Newgate and the Richmond bridewell, should be consolidated at the latter prison, where there is ample room for classification; and that all fees for officers in courts of justice, should be abolished; and that the clerks of the crown and the peace, and other persons who have heretofore received fees on conviction or acquittal of prisoners, should be compensated by salaries.

Does any complaint arise in Dublin, at the present moment, out of the present mode of valuation of ministers money?—I have not heard any complaints.

Are you aware of any inequality of taxation arising in consequence of the old assessment of the ministers money, which is made the basis of the local taxation?—There may be many instances cited, of suffering from the ancient mode of levying, but I rather think, not to the extent that many imagine. Having read the report of the evidence before this honourable Committee, last session, I made inquiry upon the subject, particularly with respect to the house formerly occupied by Lord Tyrawley; it was stated in evidence that the sum rated upon that house was 8*s.* and I find it is 60*s.* the highest rate payable in Dublin.

Who is the present occupier?—A gentleman of the name of Hart.

Are you aware how the taxes which are regulated by the ministers money, operate upon houses in High-street, and upon houses in Fitzwilliam-square?—The inhabitants of Werburg's, Michael's, Michan's, and other parishes, certainly pay a disproportionate rate of taxation for ministers money. The applotment being made upon the insolvent, as well as the solvent houses of each parish, the *solvent* inhabitants of the *poorer* parishes, pay excessive rates to make up the sums applotted thereon; whereas, in the wealthy parishes the amount of insolvencies being trifling, the rate payable by the solvent inhabitants, is considerably less in the wealthy, than in the poor parishes.

You said, that there were frauds committed by a collector of the grand jury cesses; have you known, or do you believe, that there are many frauds committed by those collectors?—From my own knowledge I cannot speak to more than one, but I believe that a great number of frauds have been committed by collectors.

Have you heard of any insolvencies of those collectors?—I have.

Have you heard of many insolvencies of those collectors?—I only know of one, a Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

To what amount is that insolvency?—It is not ascertained, in consequence of his having given in incorrect returns.

Do you believe there have been any others, for the last ten years?—I have heard of another, named Ellis, who was a defaulter to a considerable amount.

Do you know how they are appointed; do they give security on their appointment?—They are appointed by the grand jury, and give security, I understand.

Have you heard that any suit has been instituted against that Mr. O'Shaughnessy, or against his security, for that insolvency?—I have not.

Did you hear of any prosecution against him for the false returns?—I rather think he has absconded.

Do you know who his security was?—I have been told, Alderman Exshaw is his security, and that on the day of his appointment he received a sum of money as a counter security.

What is the poundage given in this case, upon the collection?—Five per cent, I think; I cannot speak positively, for the inhabitants have no access to the accounts.

What do you believe to be the poundage?—Five per cent.

Having stated that the inhabitants have no access to the accounts; have you ever applied yourself for an examination of those accounts, or known any other inhabitants apply, and what has been the result of that application?—I applied myself, in company with others, at the house of the city treasurer; others have been there several times, and have never been able to get access to the accounts; I was told that they were at the head office of police, and subsequently, I was told that they were at Mr. Bourne's office, at the court of King's Bench.

To whom did you apply?—To a clerk in the house of the treasurer of the grandjury.

Did you apply more than once?—I do not recollect that I did; but other persons did, and they stated that they could not obtain the requisite information.

Did you ever apply at Mr. Bourne's office, or any other place?—I appled at the police office, and at an office at the courts which was stated to be Mr. Bourne's; Mr. Bourne was in the country on circuit, I understood, at the time.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(28 April,)

Did you apply on your own individual capacity, or on the part of any of the inhabitants?—As appointed by the inhabitants of St. Mary; I went in company with one of the churchwardens and another gentleman.

In the case of Mr. O'Shaughnessy's deficiency, did you hear how it was supplied, whether there was any re-levy upon the inhabitants, or how the amount of it was paid in to the public account?—The insolvencies are always re-applotted on the parishes.

At what time did that deficiency occur?—I think in the course of last year.

Was the amount of that deficiency re-levied?—The amount of the deficiency has not yet been ascertained; the insolvencies returned by the collectors are levied on the parishes again; for instance, if a collector returns the most solvent man in the parish as insolvent to the grand jury, the amount of tax so returned forms part of the re-applotment on that parish.

Does it rest entirely with the collector, to determine whether the person to whom he applies for his assessment is solvent or insolvent?—I have no knowledge of any control which the parish have over his return; the body to whom the collector is accountable, is the grand jury.

Does it rest entirely with the collector, to determine whether a person is solvent or insolvent?—It does not; the grand jury of course control his return.

You say, that the collector returns a person insolvent to the grand jury; what check has the grand jury upon the collector, as to the solvency or insolvency of the person so returned by him?—By inquiry.

Is the collector's mere assertion of the insolvency of any individual, a sufficient satisfaction to the grand jury?—No; his affidavit is required.

Then the collectors hold themselves entirely accountable to the grand jury; of what class is the grand jury of the city of Dublin composed; is it confined to the corporation: Suppose a man of 10,000*l.* a year lived in the city, would he be called on the term grand jury if he did not belong to the corporation?—The grand jury is most generally composed of the leading members in the corporation, usually the same persons, term after term.

That is the presenting grand jury?—Yes; the presenting grand jury is almost exclusively composed of the members of the corporation.

Almost, or entirely?—There may be an individual instance to the contrary; but I think, generally speaking, they are altogether composed of the members of the corporation.

Any person, out of the corporation, whatever his property in the city might be, would not be called upon the presenting grand jury, or the grand jury which have to control their public accounts?—I have never known an instance of a person being summoned on the presenting grand jury, who was not a member of the corporation, with one exception; a most respectable gentleman who stated, that he was summoned on the presenting grand jury about twenty years ago, and that in consequence, as he supposes, of some inquiries which he conceived it to be his duty to make, into some matters, he has never been called upon since.

Who was that gentleman?—Mr. Arthur Guinness.

Do you know whether Mr. Arthur Guinness is, or is not, a member of the corporation?—He is a freeman, but he is not one of the common council, or board of aldermen.

By what law, or by what regulation, municipal or otherwise, is it that persons who do not belong to the corporation are prevented from being on the grand jury to make this inquiry?—I do not know of any.

Then the Committee understand you to say, that all accounts of the expenditure and levies of public money are laid before the grand jury, and that the only persons who are upon the grand jury are the members of the corporation; is that the case?—It is.

Who summons the grand jury?—The sheriff.

Are those persons who do not belong to the corporation, and are not called upon the grand jury, liable to pay their full portion of the taxes, as much as if they were?—They are.

Do those presenting grand juries consist very much of the same individuals?—They do; in the list of juries for the ten years ending 1821, there are not more than sixty persons, and many of those died during that period.

Can you inform the Committee, how often Alderman Exshaw served upon the presenting grand juries of the last twenty years?—Nineteen times out of twenty.

Can you inform the Committee whether, during those years, accounts of Alderman Exshaw's

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(28 April.)

Exshaw's, for stationery, were submitted to those grand juries for presentments?—They were, every term.

How often did Alderman Hamilton serve in those twenty years?—Sixteen times.

How often did Alderman Archer serve?—Sixteen times.

How often Alderman Cash?—Fourteen times.

Alderman Reed?—Fourteen times.

Alderman King?—Thirteen times.

What do you mean by persons of the corporation; do you mean the aldermen, sheriffs peers, and common council and freemen?—Aldermen, sheriffs peers, and common councilmen, not including freemen, who are not of the common council.

Of what number, do you suppose, those three classes consist, in the city of Dublin?—About 150.

Martis, 29° *die Aprilis*, 1823.

Mr. Richard Purdy again called in; and Examined.

(29 April.)

IN what part of the city do you reside?—At Lower Ormond quay.

You are aware, that a petition has been presented from the Saint Mary's parishioners to the House of Commons, on the subject of Local Taxation?—I am.

You were one of the petitioners in that case?—I was. did.

You attended the meeting at which it was proposed?—I

Was it prepared by the meeting at large, or by a committee appointed by the meeting?—By a committee.

Were you one of that committee?—I was.

You were one of the persons that actually prepared the petition for the approbation of the meeting?—The petition was prepared by another member of the committee.

The petition states a good many grievances?—It does.

You took pains to inform yourself of the truth of all the statements in that petition?—I did, as far as I could devote time from my own business to it.

You investigated the truth of them?—As far as I had time to do so.

Sufficient to satisfy your mind of their truth?—I think they are true, to the best of my judgment.

In your investigation, did you investigate what was praiseworthy in the establishment, as well as what might be considered the abuses?—I did.

In the course of your investigation, did you happen to meet with one single circumstance, in the whole system of grand jury presentments, that deserved praise or ought to be supported?—I do not recollect any instance.

As one of the persons appointed to prepare that petition, you look upon yourself as in some degree responsible for the truth of the facts alleged in it?—I do.

You have stated your opinion, that no effectual reform can be accomplished, unless the power of taxation be completely taken from the grand jury, and vested in the parishes?—Or vested in another power.

Did not you say, vested in the parishes?—Yes; but I merely wished to be understood, that so long as the taxing power remains in the grand juries, constituted as they are at present, and without control on the part of the inhabitants, we do not expect relief.

Are you aware by what authority the grand jury of the city of Dublin exercise their power of taxation?—I do not recollect the Acts of Parliament; but I have understood it is by Act of Parliament.

Have you, in the course of your investigations, read that Act of Parliament?—No, I rather think not.

Then the Committee are to understand, that though engaged in looking for both sides of the question fairly and dispassionately, you have never read the Act of Parliament under which the grand jury exercised their power of taxation?—I have read that of 1793, but not the Police Act.

Do you conceive that to be due diligence in a person appointed to investigate the subject?—I was not appointed to study the law, but to investigate the conduct of those grand juries, as far as it was in my power to do so.

You have stated the whole system to be erroneous; you have stated that you investigated the system; do you then think, that not investigating the power under which their right of taxation was created, is consistent with that statement?—I did

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

not enter on the subject as a professional man, but as a man of business, devoting such time as I could spare from my own concerns; I conceived that the conduct of the grand jury, and of the officers under them, was what came before me.

Do you happen to know the cause of passing that Act of Parliament, by which the power of taxation was vested in the grand juries?—I do not.

Are you aware, that the power of taxing was vested in those very parishes, and in the vestries, previous to that Act?—I have understood that all levies, as supplies for local purposes, were vested in the parishes previous to that Act.

Then you have heard, that, previous to that Act, the power of raising the local supplies was vested in the parishes in vestry assembled?—I think I have.

Then the plan which you propose, of giving the power of taxation to the parishes in vestry assembled, is not a new plan, but has been already tried?—I do not pretend to be informed on the subject, my attention being more directed to another branch of the Local Taxation of Dublin.

In point of fact, the plan of vesting the power of taxation in the parish vestries of the city of Dublin has been already tried?—I have not investigated the matter so as to be able to say that that plan has been tried.

Have not you said, and is it not the fact, that previous to the Act of 1793, the parishes in vestries assembled had the power, and the sole power, of taxing the city of Dublin?—I have understood that the parishes had a control over the paving department, and I have understood of others; but I have already said, that I have not investigated that matter; it was committed to the gentleman who assisted me.

Who was that gentleman?—Mr. M^c Mullen.

Then, with respect to whether the parishes exercised any, and if any, what power of taxation, previous to the Act of 1793, you are not informed?—No.

Are there any powers of taxation now at this moment left with the parishes at vestry?—The parish cess, I think, is the only one.

That is still left with the vestries?—Yes.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that any abuses exist in the levying of that tax at present by the churchwardens and parishes in vestry assembled?—I have not.

Have you not heard of any defaulting churchwardens, within the last two years?—I have not.

Do you believe any such do exist?—I do not.

Have you heard, or do you believe, that the Act of 1793 was passed in consequence of the enormous abuses existing in the taxation by the local vestries?—I have not heard that it was.

Have you heard, that the first effect of the Act of 1793 was to lay an extra levy of 40,000*l.* upon the citizens of Dublin, to cover the defalcations of the parish vestries?—I have not; the arrear stated in the preamble of the Act was 1,400*l.*; and the arrear at present exceeds 5,000*l.*

You have stated, that one of the causes of the increase of the grand jury cess arises from the Police Act?—I have.

How did that Police Act produce a rise in the taxation of Dublin?—By extending the jurisdiction of the recorder.

What increased expense does that bring upon the city of Dublin?—The prosecution of offences committed in that part of the city and suburbs, which is comprised in the increased jurisdiction.

What is the increased expense of those criminals?—Their support, maintenance, prosecution, and carrying the sentences into execution; the building gaols to confine them is, perhaps, the heaviest item of the grievance.

Did you happen to ascertain, in the course of your investigations, what has been the increase in the number of committals to Dublin prison since the passing of the Police Act?—I cannot state it from memory; as well as I can recollect, the number of committals has been nearly doubled within the time; but I understand that the gaol deliveries by the recorder, have latterly been held weekly, instead of once a fortnight as formerly; and I conceive, that should considerably lessen the increase of expense, taking into consideration the relative number of prisoners.

Can you take upon you to say, what was the number of committals for the year 1822, in the Dublin prisons?—About 2,100.

You have stated the Police Act to be one of the causes of the increase of the city taxation, are you aware of any other Act of Parliament having the same tendency?—The Paving Act has the same tendency.

Do you mean to say, that the Paving Act has had the effect of increasing the grand jury assessments?—No; I speak of the local taxation generally; I considered the question a general one.

Do

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

Do you know of any other Act that has necessarily increased the grand jury presentments?—The abolition of the custom which prevailed, that prisoners should pay fees upon their acquittal, I understand has had the same effect.

Are you aware, whether those Acts make it imperative, or leave it discretional with the grand jury, to present for the amount of fees?—I understand it to be imperative to present; but the jury have a discretionary power in finding the amount of those fees.

Are you aware, whether it is imperative on the grand jury to present for the expenses incurred by that Act or not?—It is imperative upon them to present, but the amount may be discretional.

Would then the removal of the grand jury jurisdiction to the parishes, relieve them from the necessity of paying the fees to the officers, while the law remains as it is?—Certainly not effectually; but I am satisfied that the discretionary power would, in such case, be of advantage to the city.

To what extent do you think, removing the jurisdiction from the grand jury to the parishes, would lessen the expenses incurred in consequence of the Police Act?—In fees and salaries to officers, and in the amount of contracts, I conceive a considerable saving would also be made, if the citizens possessed the control which is at present in the grand jury.

For the supply and the support of the prisoners?—Yes.

Do you know at what expense, upon an average, the prisoners are at present maintained in the city gaols?—I have not in my recollection the expense of the Bridewell, but I believe the expense at Newgate is at present about 5*d.* per day.

Do you know the lowest rate that the prison committee have reported, as the daily sum applicable to the support of prisoners?—Five-pence per day.

In the course of your investigations, have you satisfied yourself, whether the sum allowed for the support of the prisoners in the city gaols of Dublin, exceeds or falls short of that sum?—I drew my conclusions respecting the gross expense from comparison with other prisons.

The question is this, whether in point of fact, the prisoners of Dublin are supported at an expense greater or less than 5*d.* per day?—I do not know.

What is the number of prisoners, upon an average, confined in the gaols of the city of Dublin?—On the 17th of October, there were 318 in Newgate.

What is the average number in all the prisons?—I cannot state.

Then from your own knowledge, or your own inquiries, you are not able to answer the question?—I can state the number in the prisons upon a certain day, from my own inquiries.

By the Act of 50th of Geo. 3. fivepence per day is the minimum allowance for food alone; fivepence a day, would make 7*l.* 12*s.* 1*d.* per annum, for food alone; do you happen to know what was the amount of the sums presented in the year 1822 for the support and maintenance of the prisoners in Dublin?—Not without reference to documents already before the Committee.

From the return it appears, that the sum total was 8,282*l.* for the support and all the incidents relating to the prisoners; then you are not able to say, either what the amount of the presentments was, what the number of the prisoners to be supported was, and yet you take upon you to say, that it was an extravagant allowance for that purpose?—I have taken the liberty to say, that there were salaries, fees, and contracts made at an extravagant rate, which increased the amount of the presentment levies.

You have stated, that a considerable reduction could be effected, if this power of taxation were restored to the parish committees; upon your own knowledge, as you are at present informed, can you take upon yourself to form an opinion, whether the expense of the prisoners of the city of Dublin, under the Police Act, would be less than it has been, if the power were vested in the parishes instead of the grand jury?—I think it would.

Do you feel yourself qualified to form an opinion upon that subject?—I will give my reasons, if such is the wish of the Committee.

Can you state, whether it would be more or less, than that unknown sum, if it were to be taxed by the parishes, and not by the grand jury?—Without reference to the contracts, I could not go into those particulars; but if the Committee will give me a list of questions, I will furnish answers to them.

You stated, that you compared the expenses of the Dublin prison with other prisons; what were those prisons?—Preston house of correction, Glasgow bridewell, Knutsford prison, Kilmainham gaol; and as to medical attendance and medicines, the County Dublin infirmary, Kilmainham gaol and the three prisons in London; at

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

the latter, the number of prisoners is equal to those in our prisons, and the medical expense does not amount to one third of the charge at Dublin.

What were the expenses of maintaining the prisoners per day in each of those prisons, including every incident and every expense of the prison, for security, for sustenance, for support and sickness, and every thing?—From the account of the Preston house of correction, made up to the 2d of May 1821, it appears that the average number of prisoners was 349, and that the cost of food was 2,941 *l.* 4*s.* 3*d.* that was equal to 1 *s.* 9¾ *d.* per week for each person.

For food alone?—Yes.

What do the incidents come to?—They are not stated in the account.

Then, in addition to that sum, there is the clothing and the expenses of keeping the gaol in repair?—Yes; I may further remark, that the produce of labour in that prison when contrasted with the produce in our prisons, was very considerable indeed; the gross amount of earnings in the Preston prison, appears to be 2,941 *l.* and until last year we had not any produce from labour in our prisons.

What was the expense in Glasgow per day for food alone, independent of incidents?—About 2¼*d.* per week above the amount of the produce of labour.

In those examinations, you have ascertained what the expense of maintenance of prisoners was in those respective gaols of Glasgow, Knutsford and Preston; did you ascertain what the daily expenses of the Dublin prisoners were?—I did not.

Then you cannot ascertain it in fact?—No.

Then, how could you form any comparison between the expenses of the Preston House of Correction, which you did know and investigate, and the expenses of the Dublin prisons, which you did not know, and which you did not investigate?—I certainly made an estimate at the time, but I have not the documents to refer to.

Having inquired what were the expenses of the prisoners in each of those three gaols, do you know or can you form a judgment from any investigation or any calculation, what is the expense of the Dublin prisoners?—Not without calculation, but if permitted, I could do it in a very short time.

Have you ever done it?—I have.

Can you furnish the Committee on its next sitting with such a calculation?—I can.

You have talked of improvident contracts; you have investigated those contracts; and you have stated only one that came within your own knowledge. You stated yesterday a contract for potatoes, as an improvident contract?—I considered it as an improvident contract; but I refer to it more from what took place after the contract was made, than at the time the contract was made.

Do you know of any other contracts made by that grand jury, which you feel to be improvident?—I do; contracts that I consider to be improvidently made.

What are they?—I shall be obliged to go into explanation at some length, to convey my meaning; there was a contract with Mr. Dalton for blankets, linen, bedticks, &c. and for convicts' clothing; Mr. Dalton, I understand, was foreman to an alderman of the corporation.

In what year was this?—In the years 1821 and 1822.

Was Mr. Dalton the contractor for the clothing in the year 1822?—His name was in the Richmond bridewell visiting room, as the contractor.

Do you know of any other contract that you call improvident?—Those are the only two that I at present recollect.

Are you aware that all contracts are made by the grand jury, after public notice, and with the lowest bidder?—I am.

Are you aware, that in the case of the contract for potatoes at 6 *l.* a ton, there were only two bidders?—I have been told so.

Do you believe it?—I do.

Do you believe that there was a public advertisement in the paper, calling upon all persons to send in contracts?—I do.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that the grand jury objected to both those contracts, being both at 6 *l.* per ton?—I have heard that they did.

Have you heard that they applied to the court on the subject, stating the enormity of the proposals that were offered?—I have been recently told so.

Do you believe it?—I do.

Do you believe that they represented to the court, their unwillingness to accede to so enormous a contract?—I think it likely, that that was the case; I have no reason to doubt it.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that the court instructed them that they had no discretion, and that they must present to the lowest bidder?—I have been told so.

Mr. Richard Purdy. (29 April.)

Do you believe it?—I have no reason to doubt it.

Then the improvidence of that contract, is not attributable to the grand jury?—Under those circumstances, certainly not

Then how could that improvident contract have been remedied, if it had been before the parish committees, and not before the grand jury?—I am inclined to think, that there would have been more bidders before the parishes, than before the grand jury.

Was it publicly advertised?—I conclude that it was.

Was it open to every human being to make a proposal?—It was open to make a proposal; but I have heard persons say, who have proposed for contracts with those grand juries, that it was quite useless to do so; one person in particular made this remark.

Who was that?—A clothier in High-street; he proposed for the supply of blankets and convicts' clothing.

At how much?—I do not know.

Will you state the particlars of that?—When I had referred to the accounts of the prisons at Preston and Glasgow, and other prisons, and compared the amount with the amount levied in Dublin for a similar object, I concluded, that there must be something wrong; and I proposed to visit the Richmond bridewell, and to take a person with me who was competent to give an opinion on the articles supplied; I applied to a third person to go with me, and he went also; there was a Russian gentlemen in Dublin, who was anxious to see our prisons, and he went with us to the prison; he remarked, that the prison was badly constructed for the purpose for which it was intended, which led to further inquiries, the result of which was, the conclusion, that it was badly constructed; this gentleman had seen a great many, and he spoke with great praise of one at Limerick; he went through the prison and examined the bedding, having the gentleman, whom I have named as a clothier of High-street, with us; we also examined the provisions, and remarked, in one corner of the storehouse, a heap of potatoes of very inferior quality; I applied to the deputy governor, the governor being absent, to know why those potatoes were received, as I conceived they were very inferior; he stated, that the prisoners had objected to use them; I then asked who was the contractor, he mentioned a person of the name of Richardson, whose brother is, I understand, in partnership with a brother of Sir George Whitford, ex-sheriff; I asked the rate of contract, and he told me, that under a recent Act of Parliament, the contracts were all exposed in the visiting room; I subsequently referred to that list, and I perceived that the contract was made at 6*l.* per ton; I stated to the deputy governor, that I conceived it was a very exorbitant rate for potatoes, and that the potatoes ought to be of better quality; his reply was, that he had applied to the contractor for better quality, as the contract was for the best apple potatoes; that the contractor refused to give better; and to accommodate matters, that he, the deputy governor, sent to market and purchased potatoes at 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* per ton, and that the difference between 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* per ton and 6*l.* per ton, was paid to the contractor for the purpose, he said, of giving good potatoes to the prisoners, and at the same time not infringing the contract that had previously been made with the contractor; I thought the proceeding a very extraordinary one; we made further inquiry on the subject, and the governor of Bridewell stated to the gentleman who made inquiry, that the difference of price was not absolutely paid to the contractor, but that he still demanded it from the grand jury, in consequence of which the original statement which I received from the deputy governor was altered. I asked the clothier who accompanied me, his opinion of the quality of the blankets in the prison, and he stated that some of them were very good, and some of them inferior; he stated also, that he had proposed to contract for those blankets and other matters for the use of the prisoners.

What other matters?—Linens; I think that a similar contract was proposed by Mr. Dalton, whom he described to us as shopman or foreman to an alderman of the corporation; he stated, that he had a friend on the grand jury who was anxious to obtain it for him; that this friend was obliged to go to England on business, and that in his absence Mr. Dalton obtained the contract. I made further inquiries respecting Mr. Dalton, and I have reason to conclude, that he had been in the employment of the alderman I allude to, and circumstances that have occurred since, rather lead me to think that the alderman was more or less concerned in the the contract, or in supplying necessaries for the prisons.

Have

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

Have you any thing more to add?—I also perceived that there were a number of additional cells in progress of being built; I inquired who the contractor for those cells was, and I was told a person of the name of O'Brien was doing the work; not knowing any respectable person of that name in the trade, I made inquiry, and was informed that this O'Brien was foreman in the concern of an alderman, usually upon the grand juries; I thought it my duty to inquire whether the person was there or not, and a person of the name of O'Brien appeared to have the management of the works; I also made inquiry respecting the contractor for some iron work or metal work that was going forward at the prison, and I was told that the contractor was a Mr. Mallett, whom I have never known to conduct any iron works or metal works; he was a plumber; I do not know whether he is in the corporation or not, but it was stated as the general opinion in Dublin, that there was a partnership between him and an alderman of the corporation.

With regard to the contract for clothing, you stated that you went to the prison in order to ascertain the comparative expense?—I asked the deputy governor the cost of clothing convicts in the prison, and he stated, that in the Richmond prison, the clothing cost eight shillings per suit; that they made the clothing in the prison; I saw in the list of contracts, one for convicts clothing, at twenty-two shillings per suit, and I thought this a little extraordinary; it was for the prisoners at Newgate; and I proposed to send a competent person to the prison to inspect this clothing; a merchant tailor, a respectable man, was sent to the prison for the purpose of making the inquiry, he stated that the clothing at Newgate was different from that at Richmond bridewell, but that he could very well afford to supply such as was charged at twenty-two shillings, at the rate of seventeen shillings per suit, and have a fair profit.

Did you see the pattern blanket?—I asked for the pattern blanket, and could not see it, at the Richmond bridewell.

Did you see the pattern linen?—No, none of the patterns; this merchant tailor also stated, that he could have supplied bed ticks which he saw at Newgate, at twenty-five per cent lower than the rates charged in the contract.

Who is this merchant tailor?—His name is Uffington, of Batchelor's-walk.

Is he a man of eminence?—He is.

What year was this in?—1822.

Have you any thing more to add with respect to the contracts?—I do not recollect any thing more on the subject.

Did you converse with Mr. Uffington on this subject freely; do you suppose that he will offer for the next contract to supply the prisoners?—I rather think not.

Why do you think not?—The feeling is very general in the city, that it is useless to make proposals for contracts, without (to use a familiar term) having a friend at court.

Has Mr. Uffington, or any other gentleman of your acquaintance, put that feeling to the test?—One person stated that he had several times made proposals for contracts, and he was surprised that he seldom or never could obtain one; he made it his business to inquire particularly into the subject, and he ascertained that a pattern of a prime article was frequently sent to the grand jury at a moderate rate, and that after the contract was made, an article of inferior value would be substituted.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that every contract of every sort, kind and description, is published in the public papers, calling upon bidders to propose?—I do.

Did Mr. Saul assert that he had ever proposed for a contract, and that the contract was given to a person who bid higher than he?—He did not.

In point of fact, Mr. Saul's complaint is, that he did not get the contract, but not that he bid less than the person who did get it?—His complaint was, that his offer was as low as any person could fairly supply the article, and that he did not obtain the contract.

Did he offer it lower than the person who got the contract; do you believe that in any one instance, in all the supplies that are furnished to the grand jury by contract, you ever knew of one single instance of a person getting it, when there was a person proposing at a lower rate?—I do not know of any such instance.

Do you believe any such instance ever existed?—I have no reason to believe or disbelieve it.

Then in point of fact, you are satisfied that the lowest bidder has, without

a single

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

a single exception, always got the contract?—I am by no means satisfied of that, but I know of no instance to the contrary.

Have you heard of any instance to the contrary?—Only the facts stated to me by Mr. Saul.

Did he say that he bid a lower sum than the person who got it?—He did not say that.

Have you any reason to believe that a contract is ever given to the higher bidder, to the prejudice of the lower bidder?—I have not known any instance of it.

On what do you ground your doubts, if you are not satisfied?—The circumstances I have stated with respect to Mr. Saul's proposal.

You stated that it was not at a less sum than the person who got it?—I did not.

In point of fact, did he state, or do you believe, that in any contract for which he ever proposed to the grand jury, that he lost that contract by its being given to a person who bid higher than he?—I cannot say that he did.

Have you any reason to doubt the fact, that the contract is always given to the lowest builder?—Nothing further than I have already stated, whether that may be a reason, or not, it is the only one I can offer.

You have made extensive inquiries on the subject?—I have endeavoured to state to the Committee the result of those inquiries.

Did you ever make the inquiries with the object of ascertaining whether such practice did prevail, or not, as giving the contracts to higher bidders, to the prejudice of those who offered on lower terms?—It is very generally asserted that preferences have been given.

Have you yourself made inquiries to ascertain the existence or non-existence of that?—I am not acquainted with many persons who are in the habit of making contracts for the prisons; the only person I know is Mr. Saul of High-street, and I did not know, nor have I ever met him, to my knowledge, before or since the day upon which he accompanied me to the bridewell.

Did you inquire of Mr. Saul, whether he bid lower than the person who got the contract?—I did.

What answer did he give you?—He stated he could not tell as to bidding higher or lower, but that the persons who usually contracted, delivered an article much inferior to the pattern sent in with the proposal.

Then, as far as the contract went, it was given to the lowest bidder?—Such would be the conclusion upon the case mentioned.

Are you aware that the grand jury have nothing to say to the quality of the supply; that it falls to another tribunal to investigate that?—I was not aware of it.

You have heard that the potatoes delivered were bad, and not according to the proposal?—I saw that they were so.

Are you apprized, that in consequence of that bad supply, the further supply by that person was stopped by the inspector?—I was not apprized of it.

You were apprized that the potatoes were actually provided in the market at that lower price?—To accommodate matters in the prison.

Are you aware that that could not have been by the deputy governor, but that it must have been by the inspector?—I am not.

Are you aware that the inspector advanced the money for that?—I am not.

Are you aware that it was by the direction of the inspector that those potatoes were provided?—I am not.

Are you aware that the contract that was made with this contractor required him to deliver such potatoes as should be approved of by the inspector?—Yes.

Are you aware that the inspector refused to certify to the supply or quality?—I am not.

Are you aware that without that certificate the man could not be paid for what he furnished, or the difference between what he furnished and the full contract?—I am not.

Are you aware that at this moment the contractor has never received one farthing on account of that contract?—I am not, but I should not be surprised at it; the matter was made known as soon as we possibly could, there was no secret made of it.

Are you aware that the inspector interfered to remedy the bad quality of the provisions, before it was known to St. Mary's parish, or any other human being but himself?—I am not.

Are you aware that to this hour the public have not paid one single farthing on account of that contract?—I am not.

Mr. *Richard Purdy.*

(29 April.)

Do you think that, till a payment is made on account of it, the public have suffered any thing by it?—I do not.

In what better situation could the public be, if the right of making those contracts were vested with the parish committees?—In consequence of the inquiries that were made, it has not as yet cost the public any thing; but I question very much whether, if those inquiries had not been made, it might not have cost something.

Then you have ascertained that the contract was made, and that the contract was not fulfilled; but with respect to any other circumstances touching that contract, you know nothing about it; are you aware that all contracts are read in open court by the judge?—I have understood that the particulars of contracts are not so read; if they were, it would appear strange that the contractors have been almost uniformly the relations or connexions of the grand jurors.

Have you ever attended in the court of King's bench, at the time the judge gave his fiat for contracts?—Never; I never gave any attention to the subject until I was requested to inquire into it by the parish of St. Mary.

Have you ever heard of any gentleman attending for that purpose?—I have.

Did you inquire of Mr. Saul, whether he attended to hear which contract had the preference, on the day on which the judge was to read the contracts in court?—I did not.

You say, that Mr. Saul attended you on your visit to Richmond bridewell?—He did.

And you say also, that the contracts for the different articles supplied at the prisons are posted up in some conspicuous parts; do you recollect whether Mr. Saul looked at the price at which that contract for blanketing was supplied at that prison?—I rather think he did.

Did he state that that price was under the offer that he made for supplying the same articles?—I cannot bring to my recollection that he stated so much; but he stated that the manner in which many persons obtained contracts was by sending in a false pattern.

Mr. Saul, during his visit, inspected the bedding and provisions?—He inspected the bedding.

Did he not state, that a considerable part of that bedding was of the very best description?—That part was of a fair quality, and that part was of inferior quality; in the size there was also a material difference, the old being 2 yards by 1¾, and the new only 1¾ by 1½ yard.

Was the impression upon your mind, that the whole supply was of inferior quality?—No.

But he did not make any observation as to a manifest inferiority in the article of blanketing?—As to part of it, he did.

Who had been the contractor for blanketing for the last four years?—Mr. George Studdart, a police magistrate, and frequently upon grand juries; Mr. Dalton has also been the contractor; and occasionally large sums have been presented to the inspector and to Mr. Lees, chief clerk at the police office, for this article.

You stated that you, in company with Mr. Uffington, examined the clothing?—I proposed that Mr. Uffington should be applied to, to visit Newgate, to inspect the clothing and other materials; but I did not accompany him.

Did you not state, that the clothing at the Richmond penitentiary, was different from that at Newgate?—So it was stated to me.

Who is it stated by?—Mr. James Uffington.

The convicts clothing in the penitentiary you stated to be supplied at 8*s.* a suit?—The deputy governor stated that they made the clothing in the prison, and that the expense was 8*s.* a suit.

Those for Newgate cost 22*s.*?—They did.

Mr. Uffington stated that he could supply them at less?—He did; he stated that he could supply them at 17*s.* a suit; I have it here under his hand.

Did he make any proposal to the grand jury accordingly; in his life time did he ever make any proposal?—I do not know.

Can you form any belief whether he ever made a proposal?—I cannot.

Are you aware that the clothing for the convicts is different from that which is supplied for the Richmond penitentiary?—It was so stated.

Are you aware of the reason of that?—No.

Are you aware that the grand jury have nothing on earth to say with respect to the pattern of the clothes provided for transportation?—I am not.

Are

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

Are you aware that government sent down the description and nature of the clothes to be provided, without any communication with the grand jury?—I was not aware of it.

Are you aware of the rate at which those clothes are supplied for the convicts?—The contract was at twenty-two shillings per suit.

By whom were they so supplied?—By Mr. Dalton, as I was informed.

Are you sure that Mr. Dalton was the contractor?—I was told that the contract was in his name.

Are you sure that the contract was in his name?—It was so stated respecting the contract to which I allude.

Are you aware that there is such a person in the city of Dublin as a man of the name of Graham, a merchant tailor?—I know a Mr. Christopher Graham, a member of the common council, a wholesale woollen merchant, but not a merchant tailor.

Do you mean to say that he was not the contractor in his own name, and in his own person?—I do; there was a subsequent contract which I understand has been taken by Mr. Christopher Graham.

Subsequent to when?—Subsequent to the early part of 1822; I do not know the date.

Do you mean to say that the supply of October 1822, was not by Mr. Graham?—I do not go so far as to say that, but I say that the name I saw in the prison was Dalton, not Graham; I certainly understood the name to be Dalton.

Are you aware that the supply contracted for originally, for the supply of the contract, turned out to be deficient, that is, there were not sufficient number of suits for the number of convicts?—I am not.

Are you aware that when the stipulated number was provided, that application was made for the contractor to provide as many more as were required?—I am not.

Are you aware that he refused to supply any more, as he had lost by his contract?—I am not.

Are you aware that the grand jury, upon more than one occasion, refused the increased salary of 100*l.* a year to the prison inspector, upon his application?—I have seen it stated.

Do you believe it?—I have no reason to believe it or to doubt it.

Where have you seen it stated?—In a work printed and given to the friends of the officers of the prisons.

Have you heard, or do you believe, that after that being on more occasions than one refused by the grand jury, that the judge himself, under the circumstances of the case and the great increase of public duties, ordered it?—It is so stated by officers of the prisons.

Do you believe it?—I have no reason to believe or to doubt it.

Upon seeing it in print, or hearing it from others, you have no reason to doubt it?—I have no reason either to believe it or doubt it, from seeing it in print.

You believe every thing that you have heard from the persons who supplied the materials for the parish report; you believe what you heard from Mr. Uffington?—I do.

You believe what Mr. Saul told you?—I do.

You believe what the deputy governor of the prison told you?—I have no reason to doubt it.

You believe every statement that you have given us here of the abuses?—I believe that every thing I have stated is truly stated by me.

A great part of that statement arises from information you have received from others, and not from your own knowledge?—It does, from disinterested persons as I conceive.

Then every statement you have mentioned you believe?—I do.

Are you a freeman of Dublin?—I am not; I am a householder, paying the city taxes.

Are you aware, that you have the power as a freeholder, of traversing any presentment that the grand jury chooses to pass?—I am.

Have you ever traversed any of those contracts?—I have not; as an individual, I would rather pay my proportion than traverse, except for a public object; but the parish of St. Mary attempted to traverse the presentments made in Michaelmas term.

What was the result of that attempt?—The result was, that the presentments were fiated; I understand the judge came at an early hour in the morning, to discharge a jury, that the persons who were employed to appear for the parishes, were

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(29 April.)

were late in going to court, and the presentments were fiated prior to their appearing there; they subsequently attempted to traverse, and were defeated upon a point of law; I believe the law prescribes, that persons must traverse within a certain time, and it was stated that the parishes of Saint Mary and Saint Thomas, were late upon that occasion.

Those parishes and many other parishes, are very anxious not only to inquire into the amount of the levies, but to relieve themselves, if possible, from some part of the taxation?—They are most anxious.

Are the Committee to understand, that you have had several meetings on that subject?—We have.

You have attended those meetings?—I have attended some of them.

Has it ever been discussed at any of those meetings, whether they were more likely to succeed in relieving themselves from these unjust assessments by traverse, than by assembling in vestries, and coming to certain resolutions, which could lead to no effect?—I never attended any of the vestries that were called for considering the propriety of traversing.

The Committee are to understand from you, that you were deliberating on the means of relieving yourselves; in discussing that subject, what were the modes of relief that were offered to the consideration of the vestries?—The question has been frequently discussed, and it was the general opinion, that traversing would not give effectual relief; for large portions of the grand jury assessments are levied under Acts of Parliament, and cannot be corrected except by Act of Parliament, and consequently that no traverse on the part of the parish could afford effectual, though it might partial relief.

Did you ever hear it proposed, that in the first instance, those who felt themselves aggrieved should have recourse to law proceedings for redress, and endeavour by means of traverse, to relieve themselves from that unjust assessment?—It was proposed in that instance I have mentioned, and counsel was instructed to traverse.

Were the gentleman whom you have stated, to be so interested on this subject, so timid as to be alarmed at one repulse, and that repulse arising from a point of form?—If we do not obtain relief from this Committee, we must try it on another occasion, although at the risk of paying double costs.

Was the question discussed, of the option between a traverse and an application to the House of Commons?—It was, more than once; and we were in hopes we might obtain relief in some degree by traverse; but the material part must come from Parliament. Counsel was employed for the purpose of traversing

Who was the counsel?—Mr. Walker for St. Thomas's and St. Mary's parishes; Mr. Cullen also attended.

Those gentlemen informed you, that there is a particular Act relating to the city of Dublin?—There are various Acts of Parliaments.

Are you not aware that those Acts, so far as regards the assessing and levying of money do not differ in a great degree from the general Act of Parliament, regulating assessments through all Ireland?—I am not aware of any distinction, except that which limits the amount of cess, in the county of Dublin, to two shillings per acre, whereas there is no limit to the presentments of the city grand jury.

Then the Committee are to understand, that you expected more redress from Parliament, than from any proceeding in the courts of justice?—Yes.

On what ground was it that you and the other gentlemen with you, preferred looking to Parliament, rather than have recourse to the remedy by traverse?—In addition to the reasons already stated, we understood, that it was intended to bring in a bill to extend the taxing power of the grand jury, to those parts of the city not under the control of the grand jury; and we were of opinion, that the measure would not afford effectual relief to the inhabitants.

From whom had you that information?—From Mr. Stewart and others, deputed to wait on the supposed framer of the bill, to request permission to read it, on the part of St. Mary's parish.

You have no reason to think, that there was a denial of inquiry, or a denial of the right of traverse by the court of King's-bench?—By no means, nothing could be farther from my thoughts.

The parishes have not given up their intention of proceeding in that way also?—With repect to those items, that we think we can be relieved from, we shall no doubt, resort to those means, if not effectually relieved by Parliament.

Mercurii, 30 *die Aprilis,* 1823.

Mr. Richard Purdy, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Purdy. (30 April.)

IN a former period of your examination, you stated an instance of improper conduct of a collector of the grand jury cess, in the case of a person of the name of Welsh?—I did.

Where does that Welsh reside; is the person you allude to, a man or a woman?—A woman; she resides on the City Quay.

Of what trade is she?—She deals in cordage.

Is she the owner of the house?—She states herself to be so.

Is her name over the door?—It is.

She stated that she had paid to the collector 3 *l.*?—She did.

Did she say she had had a receipt for it?—She did.

Did you ask to see that receipt?—I did.

Did you see it?—I did.

Was it a regular receipt for the amount of the grand jury cess?—It was a very incorrect receipt; it would read for either shillings or pounds.

Whatever it was, was it a regular receipt, such as is given for grand jury taxes?—It was on printed paper.

On a stamp?—I do not know.

Having investigated the local taxation of Dublin, are you aware what is the protection against any person being called upon a second time for his taxes?—I am not; when this woman called upon me I refused to interfere for her till she went before a magistrate and made an affidavit to the fact.

Did she ever bring that receipt, or show it at the proper office, to prove her payment of the taxes?—I do not know whether she did or not, but I sent it to the treasurer of the grand jury, stating the circumstances, and referring him to the affidavit, and requesting him to give the woman relief.

Was she relieved?—She was not.

Has she paid the taxes a second time?—She has not.

Then she has not yet sustained any loss?—She has not, but she has been threatened by the collector to have her goods seized.

In point of fact, he has not done that?—He had not done it when I left Dublin; I stated to the collector that I had forwarded a memorial to the grand jury, and requested that, until the memorial was answered, he would not distress her.

Are you sufficiently informed, on the taxation of Dublin, to know that if any legal proceedings were taken, that that stamp receipt was a full bar to any proceedings?—I think it would; I do not know whether it would against a treasurer, but it would against a collector.

Is not the collector appointed by the grand jury?—He is.

Does not he give security?—He does.

Does not he receive a warrant from the grand jury?—He does.

Are not the grand jury accountable for every act done by the collector?—I do not know.

You stated that you attended at the Richmond penitentiary, in company with a Russian gentleman and some others?—I did.

Who were the persons that attended with you?—Mr. Kertland, of Lower Ormond-quay, one of the committee of Saint Mary's, and Mr. Saul of High-street.

You went there as a deputation authorized by the committee?—We did.

You and Mr. Kertland were the persons appointed by the Committee to investigate?—We were, and one of the churchwardens was also appointed.

He was not with you?—He was not.

Can you recollect when you paid your visit?—I cannot; I have handed in a report on the subject.

Was it in the month of November?—It was in September or October, as well as I can recollect.

There was no other report made on that subject by any person but you and the gentlemen that went with you?—There was a gentleman to whom I have already alluded, Mr. H. Uffington, who was appointed to go to Newgate, and he went also to Richmond bridewell.

Was it previous to that?—I think that was in October.

Was that previous or subsequent to your visit?—It was subsequent.

You

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(30 April.)

You were the only persons appointed by the committee?—As well as I can recollect.

You were the only persons who reported to the committee on the subject of the Richmond penitentiary?—We were the only persons appointed so to do.

When you went there, you found the bad potatoes heaped up in a corner, you took notice of them?—We did.

The deputy governor told you that they had been objected to by the prisoners?—He did, upon my remarking that they were of very inferior quality.

And that he was then supplying them himself, by purchasing at a very under rate?—At 1 *l.* 13 *s.* 4 *d.* per ton.

Then the condemnation of the bad potatoes, and the purchase of the good potatoes in their stead, took place previous to your visiting?—It did.

Then it could not be in consequence of your suggestions?—Certainly not.

When did the parishes first meet to inquire into those local abuses?—On the 5th of September St. Mary's appointed a committee.

Do you know when the potatoes were changed?—I do not.

Do you think it was subsequent to the 5th of September?—I do not know positively, but I think it must have been subsequent.

Did you go through the prison?—I did.

Was it clean?—Very much so indeed.

Did there seem to be good order there?—Very good order.

Was the classification as correct as the nature of the prison would allow?—It appeared to be so.

Did the inmates appear to be regular and cleanly in their persons?—They did.

Did the prisoners that were able to work appear to be industriously employed?—They did, generally speaking.

Are you aware that there is a book for visitors to make their remarks?—I am.

Did you make any remarks in that book?—I may have done so, I do not recollect.

Then, in point of fact, you thought the appearance, the regulation, the discipline and the cleanliness of the prison very good?—Unobjectionable

In the beginning of your examination did you, or did you not say, that you had not, in the course of your investigation, found one single subject of praise to the grand jury?—I may have said so.

Does this form an exception?—If it applies to the grand jury it does, but I give the credit of it to the governor and deputy governor.

Who is the governor appointed by?—By the grand jury, or commissioners of the prison.

Who is the governor?—Mr. Purdon; he is son-in-law to Alderman Archer.

Who supplies the fund by which the prison is sustained and supported; is it by grand jury presentments?—It is partly by grand jury presentments and partly by their own labour, and I have perceived some advances made by government for implements for the prisons; I have found it extremely difficult to make any estimate as to the exact expense per diem.

Did you call for the dietary?—I rather think I did.

Does it appear upon the face of that written dietary what is the expense of each prisoner per diem?—I believe it does, as stated by the officers.

You saw that dietary?—I think I did.

Then how comes it that you do not know what the expense per diem is?—I did not take any note of it.

You went to investigate the expense?—I did.

A table was shown to you containing the expense, and you took no notice of it?—I took no notice of that, but I have no hesitation in saying, upon a comparison with other prisons, that the expense of supporting prisoners in Dublin, far exceeds the expense in other prisons; I do not mean as to food alone, but food and clothing and all the expenses together; I have estimated the expense in the bridewell at the rate of 36 *l.* for each prisoner per annum.

Do you mean to say, that the expense of each person, upon your investigation in the penitentiary, was 36 *l.* a year including every thing?—Including a proportion of salaries to officers, and incidents altogether.

Will you state to the Committee, on what principle you came to the calculation of each person costing 36 *l.* a year?—The expense of the Richmond bridewell is estimated at about 5,500 *l.* half-yearly, according to the presentment sheets; taking from that 1,000 *l.* which is for repayment to government, on account of the expenditure

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(30 April.)

expenditure on the building, leaves 4,500*l.* If there were 250 prisoners, which is the average number, the expense would be 36*l.* for each, exclusive of the repayment to government; but if the 1,000*l.* that is presented each term for repayment to government, was excluded in the amount, the expense in that case, would be 44*l.* a year for each prisoner, that is, charging the prison with a proportion of the salaries, say two-fifths of the entire.

That is taking the total expense of the prison on the one hand, and dividing that by the average number of prisoners on the other, and you mean to say that it is 36*l.* a year per head?—Including a proportion of the allowance for salaries, I rather think it comes to 5*d.* a day.

Will you take upon you to say, that the expense for food daily is 3 ¾ *d.*?—It may have been, but supposing the rate to be 5*d.* in England, I think, 3 ¾ *d.* would not be very low in Ireland.

Do you know how many descriptions of grand juries in Dublin have the power of raising money by taxation?—Two descriptions, I have understood, the term grand jury, and the sessions grand jury.

What are the objects presented for by the term grand jury?—The support of prisoners, and all those items included in the presentment sheet as having passed by the term grand jury.

What is the description of presentments made by the sessions grand jury; is there any difference between them?—There is this difference, that the presentments of the sessions grand jury arose from fees to officers, matters of stationery for the sessions house, repairs of the sheriffs prison occasionally, and cleaning the prison; the only remark that I have to make respecting the sessions grand jury is, that I know an individual who was on that grand jury, and he stated to me, that an account for stationery was presented to the jury, and that he stopped the account to look at it; the foreman of the jury, a sheriff's peer, told him to send it on; the juror said, he wished to look at it before he passed it; send it on says the foreman, we have enough (meaning a majority) without you; the juror said, I cannot send it on without remarking on one item; here is a charge at the rate of a guinea per hundred for quills; the account was passed, and the juror has never been summoned upon a sessions grand jury since.

What is the gentleman's name?—Mr. Kertland.

Is he in attendance upon this Committee?—I do not know whether he has been summoned, he was on the committee of St. Mary's parish.

Do you happen to know what are the sums presented by the grand jury of the city of Dublin, for the total and entire support of the prisoners confined in all the Dublin gaols together?—Including cost of prosecution, the amount is about 25,000*l.*

Do you happen to know what the average number of prisoners in all those prisons put together amount to?—I think from 700 to 750.

Do you mean in all the prisons in Dublin?—Yes, in those for which grand jury cess is levied.

How many prisons are there in Dublin?—Those I allude to are supported by the grand jury cess; the Newgate, the Richmond bridewell, the Smithfield penitentiary, and the sheriff's prison.

Is there not besides a gaol for poor prisoners, who cannot support themselves, annexed to the sheriff's prison?—I have understood that there is, but the expense of it must have been considerably reduced by the more frequent discharge of prisoners, under the Insolvent Act; as prisoners for debt have usually sufficient for their support during the short periods of their confinement under the present Act.

By whom is the gaol allowance supplied?—By presentments of the grand jury.

Who keeps it in repair?—I have seen charges included in the presentment sheet of the grand jury.

Who pays for the whitewashing of it?—The grand jury.

Who contracts for the whitewashing?—Sheriff Thorp, to whom there appears to have been five presentments, last Michaelmas term.

Is it, or is it not the subject of annual competition by advertisement for the lowest bidder?—I believe it may be like the other contracts.

Can you form a guess as to what the general sum total of presentments by grand juries was in the year 1822?—I have not seen the return for 1822, that for 1821 states the amount at 27,515*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.*

Are you aware, that no money for any contract of any sort, kind or description, is ever paid or advanced to any human being, but to the identical contractor himself,

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(30 April.)

self, immediately from the treasurer of the grand jury and not through the inspector?—I am not aware that such is the custom.

If that be case, is it possible that the inspector could mis-appropriate what did not come into his hands?—Certainly; it is impossible.

If you had made an inquiry from the grand jury treasurer, was it competent to you to have learnt that fact or not?—I found it extremely difficult to obtain any information, and several persons applied without success.

Are you aware, that no sum is advanced by the grand jury, to any person, contractor or otherwise, until the contract is fulfilled?—I have seen charges in the presentment sheets, of various sums advanced to Mr. Gamble and others for necessaries.

Did you ever see a sum in any presentment advanced to any person on account of a contract?—I am not aware of any advance made on a contract; I have seen sums of money presented for Mr. Ricard to supply bread for Newgate for six months, commencing the late term, 700*l.* and to Mr. John Glennon, to supply milk, 200*l.* I have here a copy of one of the printed sheets; it is impossible for me to show whether any payments have been made; but large sums have evidently been presented for the inspector and other officers to supply necessaries for the prisons.

Is not the presentment sheet publicly printed in the city of Dublin?—It is; but that does not enable me to answer the question, whether advances have been made.

Did you apply for information on the subject of the grand jury accounts?—I applied at the office of the treasurer of the grand jury, and I also applied at the head police office. Alderman Darley was good enough to instruct the secretary to allow me to have access to the accounts at the police office; but from those accounts I could not obtain the information which the Committee require.

In point of fact, you do not know of any sums being paid to contractors, on account of contracts?—I do not.

Do you know the forms that are observed before the amount of a contract is paid to any contractor?—I do not.

You see certain sums presented for in the presentment sheet, to be advanced to the inspector for particular purposes; do you observe what they are for?—I have stated what some of them are for.

The question referred to monies advanced to inspectors of prisons; do you not find sums advanced to pay hatchmen in the prisons?—I have seen items entered in the presentment sheet as paid to the inspectors of the prisons for various purposes.

There is a sum to pay hatchmen, and fifty pounds for incidents; are there any others?—I find two sums, one 684*l.* the other 600*l.* to supply necessaries, and I have no doubt there are many others.

Do you happen to know the reason of that sum being presented to be advanced to pay hatchmen?—I consider it is for salaries.

Do you know the reason of that being advanced and no other being advanced?—I do not.

The sum which is there presented is not raised for some time afterwards?—It is not.

In the usual course how long after it is presented is it actually raised?—A considerable time afterwards.

Then in point of fact, though it is presented to be advanced, it cannot be paid till it is raised?—No.

Upon an average it is not three months before it is actually repaid?—I believe it may be.

That is half the time before the next held grand jury?—Yes.

Then for those three months, the purposes for which that money is alleged to be advanced to the inspector, are obliged to be borne by the inspector without any advantage?—That is the natural conclusion.

Then for three months out of the six, he is in advance out of his own pocket before he receives the money?—According to the statements in the preceding questions, he may be in advance.

It is to pay hatchmen?—One of the items is.

Is not the object of it that they should be paid weekly?—I imagine so.

Then for the first three months he is in advance for their weekly allowances to them?—So it would appear.

You stated a supposed partnership between Mr. Mallett, who was the contractor for

Mr. Richard Purdy. (30 April.)

for the iron work, and a member of the corporation, frequently upon grand juries?—I have heard it alleged, and I thought it came from good authority.

You said that Mr. Mallett was only a plumber?—I have understood so.

Have you ever been at his manufactory?—I have been some time ago, but not lately.

In point of fact, you do not know that he is an iron-founder to a considerable extent?—I do not.

Are you aware that any person on the grand jury, who has any connection, directly or indirectly, with a contractor, is liable to a penalty of five hundred pounds?—I have heard so.

You stated that a traverse had been directed by the parish of St. Mary with respect to some of those presentments?—I did.

Do you remember what were the presentments they were directed to traverse?—It was the late term grand jury presentments.

Was there a traverse for each presentment, or a sweeping traverse for the whole?—It was a sweeping traverse for the whole, on account of an improper applotment, in consequence of the treasurer of the grand jury having demanded from St. Mary's parish a larger sum of arrears than they conceived was due; an accountant had been employed to investigate the account, and on the foot of those accounts a difference arose between the mode in which this accountant stated them, and the manner in which the treasurer of the grand jury stated them: the total amount of arrears claimed by the treasurer from St. Mary's, was 1,200*l.*

In consequence, there was a sweeping traverse for the whole?—I have so understood.

Do you mean it was a sweeping traverse of all the presentments made by that grand jury, or a particular traverse to each presentment?—I cannot state the particulars; there is an affidavit of the agent who was employed on that occasion, and it will be presented to the Committee.

In point of fact, was not it only a traverse to the re-applotment for insolvencies?—I really cannot say; I know that that was a material part of the dispute; I have already stated that an account was stated by the accountant who differed with the treasurer of the grand jury on the subject.

You have heard of persons not putting in a proposal to the grand jury from an idea of favouritism in the grand jury, are you aware of the mode adopted by the grand jury in signing the contracts?—I am not.

There are officers called inspectors-general?—There are.

Have you ever made complaints to them?—No; my object was not to make complaints against any individual; our object was to obtain redress by a change of system, not by complaints against individuals; and it is with very great reluctance that I have referred to those cases, to which I have felt it my duty to allude, in my answers to questions put to me.

Are you aware whether any, and if any, what means are adopted by the grand jury to secure, as well as they are able, that the materials contracted for shall be of as good description as the pattern, in the supply of blankets, clothes, and sheets?—I have understood the inspector was intended for that purpose.

Do you know of any other?—The general inspector appointed by government.

Do you know the means taken by the grand jury themselves to ascertain that the contracts are really *bonâ fide* fulfilled?—I am not aware of the custom of the grand juries.

You have stated, that you heard there was a partnership between an alderman of the corporation and Dalton, in the contract for blankets?—I heard that a balance due to Alderman Nugent arose out of the contract with Dalton, or of the supply of necessaries for the prisons.

Dalton was the contractor for blankets?—He was the contractor for clothing, blankets, ticks, and sheets.

Was that in 1822?—In Michaelmas 1821, and Easter 1822.

Do you believe there was any connection between the alderman to whom you have alluded and Mr. O'Brien, in the contracts?—It is the general opinion, and I am rather inclined to think that there must have been a connexion.

You have stated, that you found the Richmond bridewell in good order; is there any superintending committee over that prison, except the grand juries?—I am not aware of any, except that the police magistrates have a control over it.

The governor is Mr. Purdon?—He is.

A gentleman who has been regularly graduated in college?—Yes.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(30 April.)

You said, that the general opinion in Dublin among the tradesmen was, that it was quite idle to make proposals for contracts to the grand juries?—I have heard it said.

Have you made inquiries respecting it?—I have.

Of how many have you inquired?—Of several.

And that was the general impression?—It was.

Do you know who have been the contractors for the last four years, in general, for the supply of the prisons in Dublin with provisions, and blanketing, and linen; can you mention any of their names?—Mr. Isaac Manders, son of Alderman Manders, was uniformly the contractor for bread until he retired from business, when his successor and relative obtained the contracts; this subject was mentioned in the court of King's Bench, and for some time past a Mr. Ricard has been the contractor. Alderman Manders and Richard Manders, jun. were usually upon the jury. Mr. Studdart, a police magistrate and grand juror, usually obtained the contract for blankets, until Michaelmas 1821, when Mr. Dalton became the contractor; and again at Easter 1822, Mr. Dalton was the contractor; and upon those occasions Alderman Nugent, to whom Dalton was shopman, was upon the jury. I have also been informed, that the outlay of all sums at Richmond bridewell, and at Easter term 1816, a large sum was presented to those gentlemen for certain alterations at Newgate, and at Easter 1819, a similar presentment for bridewell, to include expense of a clock, for which 370*l.* was paid to Alderman Warner or his representatives. Mr. Dalton's contract was made in Michaelmas 1821, to continue to Easter 1822, and subsequent to that, there was a contract made by Mr. Graham, who is a very respectable wholesale woollendraper, and member of the common council.

Who are the other contractors?—I find the name of Dalton in several of these presentments; Sheriff Thorp's name is upon each of them; at Michaelmas 1822, there were five presentments to him; generally the contractors are either members, or connected with members, of the corporation.

When you went to the gaols, did you inquire for the patterns?—I did; particularly for those sent by Mr. Dalton.

Did you see the patterns?—I did not.

Did you try at other gaols?—I was merely deputed to go to bridewell; the contracts were for clothing, for bedticks, for shirts and rugs for Newgate; that was the contract made by Mr. Dalton to which I alluded.

He is foreman to Alderman Nugent?—I have heard that he was.

Mr. John Mc Mullen, called in; and Examined.

Mr. John McMullen.

WHERE do you reside?—In Blessington-street, in the city of Dublin.

What is your business?—I am engaged in trade as a factor at the Linen-hall.

How long have you resided in Dublin?—About fifteen years.

Have you paid any particular attention to the local taxes of the city of Dublin?—I have, for some time past.

What circumstances induced you to pay that attention to the local taxation of the city?—The subject was forced upon my attention by the extremely distressed state of the city of Dublin, by the decay of its trade and manufactures; the experience which, in my own trading pursuits, I have individually of those circumstances, forced the subject upon my attention.

Has your attention been particularly turned to that branch of the local taxation which is levied under the authority of the grand juries of the city of Dublin?—To a considerable extent.

Are you deputed by any body of inhabitants to attend this Committee, and to give evidence?—I attended it on the summons which I received from the Committee; I have not been regularly deputed by any body of the inhabitants of Dublin; but committees have been formed, and I have been requested by those committees (if I should be summoned) to attend the Committee of the House of Commons.

On what principle is the amount of the grand jury taxation of the city of Dublin apportioned upon the property of individuals in that city?—In the mode of apportioning the tax over the district on which it is levied, the principle appears to be most objectionable. By the 33 of Geo. 3. the churchwardens are obliged to return upon oath, to the treasurer of the grand jury, an exact account of the *gross sum* of ministers money *chargeable* upon the inhabitants of each parish, from which return the Act directs that the grand jury shall, at least once in every third year, form a table of applotment of the proportion which each parish bears to the whole; and

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(30 April.)

and upon this principle the whole amount of the grand jury cess is applotted over the city of Dublin. The proportion, however, which each parish is called upon to pay is directed to be levied from the *solvent* inhabitants of such parish only; it consequently happens that in some of the poorer parishes, where one-half of all the householders are returned insolvent, (and the case at present exists in more than one parish,) the solvent inhabitants are obliged to pay double the sum for which they ought to be called upon. The parish of St. Michan's, one of the most impoverished and reduced in Dublin, contained in 1820, 1,457 houses, of which 761, or more than half, were then returned insolvent. The rate at which the grand jury cess was applotted, during that and part of the preceding year, upon that parish, was 3*s.* 6*d.* on the shilling, ministers money; and it should be recollected, that in all the ancient parishes the valuation is much higher than in the parishes of more recent creation. At the same period, in the years 1819 and 1820, in the large and wealthy parish of St. Peter's, the applotment was only 2*s.*; and in the equally opulent parish of St. Ann's, 2*s.* 0½*d.* In the Michaelmas term of 1820, the re-applotment in St. Michan's for insolvent arrears, was 1,051*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*; whilst its proportion of the grand jury cess, as fiated by the court, was only 737*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* In St. Peter's parish, at the same term, the re-applotment for insolvent arrears was only 136*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* although its proportion of the presentments amounted to 1,740*l.* 12*s.* 2*d.*

Has it come within your knowledge to state, whether there has been a considerable increase of the grand jury taxes of late?—A very considerable increase.

Can you inform the Committee, whether there has been an increase or a diminution in the ability of the people to pay?—The ability of the people to pay, as far as my knowledge of the circumstances, and the trade of Dublin extend, is very much reduced.

Can you inform the Committee, from any observations you have made, or documents that you are in possession of, of the increase of insolvencies in any of the parishes of Dublin?—In the case of the parish which I have mentioned, Saint Michan's, the increase within the last two years, I am credibly informed, is equal to one fifth of the entire number of houses, which it contains.

To what circumstances do you attribute the increase of the grand jury taxes?—In a considerable degree, to the increase of crime and committals, but not to the extent on that account by any means, to which the increase has arrived.

To what other cause then do you attribute that further increase?—I consider that the increase within the last fourteen or fifteen years has been owing in a great degree to the operation of the Police Act, by which all offenders taken up within the limits of the circular road, are sent to the city gaol of Newgate.

What parts of Dublin does the circular road comprehend not within the jurisdiction of the city?—It includes the large and wealthy parishes of St. George, St. Luke's, part of St. Peter's, part of St. Nicholas, and part of St. Catharine's.

To what other circumstances do you attribute the increase of the grand jury taxation?—The increase of grand jury taxation, I conceive, may also be considerably attributed to the large sums which are annually presented by the grand jury, for the clothing and support of convicted criminals, and the building of gaols to confine them.

Can you inform the Committee, how much of the increase is attributable to that circumstance from any document?—I have reason to believe, that at present, the expense incurred in the support of convicted criminals, is not less than ten thousand pounds a year.

Are there any other causes to which you attribute the increase of the grand jury taxation?—I think the increase is also to be attributed to the want of strict and vigilant economy, on the part of the grand jury, in the disposal of the money levied from the citizens of Dublin.

To what cause do you attribute that want of economy?—I think that large sums of money are expended in various ways, which might, under a more vigilant system of economy, be altogether saved.

Can you give any instances?—I hold in my hand the grand jury presentments of the city of Dublin, from 1807 to 1820, on which I have made some memorandums; in the Michaelmas term 1820, there are several items which appear to me to be extravagant; the first I have noticed is a charge for brushes supplied to the bridewell, amounting to 20*l.* 4*s.*

For how long?—For the half year.

Why

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(30 April.)

Why do you think that an extravagant charge?—As far as my own experience enables me to judge, I think it impossible that brushes in that quantity, or of that value, could be used in an establishment such as the bridewell, in so short a period.

Can you point out any other instances?—In the same presentments I observe an item for white-washing, painting and scouring the house-keeper's apartment; I think the charge for scouring ought not to occur in a gaol for the employment of convicts; that it ought to be done by the prisoners.

What is the sum?—11*l.* 6*s.* 7*d.* for white-washing, painting, papering and scouring.

The white-washing, painting, papering and scouring were all included in the 11*l.* 6*s.* 7*d.*?—Yes, but it was for the housekeeper's apartment only.

Does the same observation apply to the white-washing?—It does, it ought to be done by the convicts.

Does it apply to the painting?—Perhaps, neither to the painting, nor the papering, although I have no doubt there are convicts in the gaol fully competent to do both.

Will you give any other instances?—I observe in the same presentment a charge for white-washing the sheriff's prison and the city marshalsea, 34*l.*

Why do you think that an extravagant charge?—From their limited extent, I think, 34*l.* a very large amount for white-washing the sheriff's prison and the city marshalsea.

You are aware that it cannot be done by the prisoners themselves?—I am quite aware of that.

Have you reason to doubt its being done?—No. In the preceding presentments for Easter term 1820, I find a charge for brushes, mops, and some other articles for Richmond bridewell, 22*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* which appears to me to be unnecessarily large.

Is that the same prison that the others were for?—The same prison, in the preceding half year; in the course of 1821, the presentments for this apparently insignificant item of expense, amount to 78*l.* 1*s.* 7*d.*; this is for brushes only.

Is there any other instance?—There appears to me in these presentments to be an unusually heavy, and frequent charge for blankets for the prisons.

Can you point out any of the particulars to which you allude?—I have examined the printed presentments, and I find in almost every one of those presentments, a charge for blankets, in some instances to a considerable amount; as much as three hundred pairs at one term.

Are you acquainted with the prices at which those articles are supplied, or the mode which is taken to procure them on the cheapest terms?—I am not intimately acquainted with the subject, but in the course of a visit which I recently made to Newgate, I saw a number of convicts clothed in what I was told were old blankets, and as far as I can judge, those blankets cut up for clothing for them appeared to be perfectly sufficient for the use of the goal. I attribute to that circumstance the large, and perhaps unnecessary supply of blankets, which appears in the presentment sheets; there are many and various other instances to which I could refer.

Will you turn to page 102, you see there the names of the grand jury of the city of Dublin. Are you acquainted with the greater portion of those gentlemen?—I know them by character, but only a few of them personally.

Are they individuals belonging to the corporation of the city of Dublin?—They are members of the corporation of the city of Dublin.

Do you mean, by their being members of the corporation of the city of Dublin, that they are the freemen at large, or the higher authorities?—They are all aldermen, sheriff's peers, or members of the common council.

Will you look over the names of the individuals in the first page, to whom presentments of the public money are made by the grand jury, and will you state whether many of them are also members of the corporation of the city of Dublin?—A considerable proportion of them are members of the corporation.

Does the name of Alderman Exshaw appear upon that list of the grand jury?—It does.

Look at page 109; is there not there a presentment for stationery, supplied for the use of the several grand juries of the city of Dublin, 132*l*; who is the John Exshaw to whom that presentment is made?—Alderman John Exshaw.

The same individual who was a member of the grand jury?—Unquestionably.

And who was a party to the presentments so made to himself?—Unquestionably.

Will you turn to the preceding term, and see if there is any other presentment for the

Mr. John M'Mullen (30 April.)

the same purpose, to the same person: look at page 103?—There is a presentment to Alderman John Exshaw for stationery, for the use of the several grand juries, 147*l.* 17*s.* 8*d.*

Turn to page 97; who was foreman of the city grand jury in Michaelmas term 1819?—Alderman John Exshaw.

Is there any similar presentment in that year?—There is, to the amount of 150*l.* for one half year's supply.

Turn to page 87, Michaelmas term 1818; who was foreman of the grand jury on that occasion?—Alderman John Exshaw.

Does there appear any similar presentment for the same purpose, and to the same person, on that occasion?—There is a presentment to Alderman Exshaw, for printing work and stationery, 144*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

In page 78, Michaelmas term 1817, whose name appears the second in the presentment sheet of that year?—Alderman John Exshaw, second on the grand jury.

Is there a similar presentment on that occasion?—There is a similar presentment to him, of 153*l.* 19*s.* 11*d*

Will you turn to page 69?—I again find the name of Alderman John Exshaw second in the list of the grand jury, and a similar presentment to him for printing and stationery, 150*l.*

Are there other stationers of eminence in the city of Dublin, besides Alderman Exshaw?—Many, of greater eminence I should think.

Will you cast your eye generally over the returns of the names of the grand jury before you, and state whether the leading members of those grand juries are not, to a considerable extent, the same persons?—I have given some attention to the subject, and I know that such is the fact.

And they are invariably leading members of the corporation of the city of Dublin?—Invariably so.

During those years to which your attention has been called, the alderman who has been named has been upon the grand juries, and has been a party to presentments made to himself?—Unquestionably; it appeared to me, from an investigation which I had previously made on the subject, that in the 20 terms, ending Michaelmas 1820, he served upon nineteen grand juries.

Can you state the names of any other members of the corporation, who have served upon a considerable number of grand juries during the same period?—Alderman Hamilton served on sixteen of those twenty grand juries; Alderman Archer upon sixteen; Alderman Cash upon fourteen; Alderman Darley upon fourteen; Alderman Reed upon fourteen; Alderman King upon thirteen; Alderman Thorp upon twelve; Alderman Manders upon eleven; Warner upon eleven; Abbott upon ten; Bloxam upon ten; Fleming upon ten; M'Kenny upon ten; Matthew West upon ten; Jones upon nine; Nugent upon nine; James upon eight? Montgomery upon seven; Andrews upon six, and Hone upon six; Sheriffs-peers Craven and Pasley upon thirteen; Minchen and Tudor, each upon ten; Giffard upon nine; Blacker and Mander, each upon eight; and Semple upon seven.

Have you been able to compare the number of times which those individuals have served, with the general number of individuals who might have served upon the grand jury during that period?—The number of persons qualified to serve upon grand juries in the city of Dublin is supposed to be about 2,000.

Do you mean freeholders?—Freeholders, freemen, and householders.

When you say 2,000, do you mean persons who, from their stations in society, would be considered as eligible in point of opinion, as well as in point of law?—I do.

Is there any general proposition which you would deduce from your examination of these facts?—It is unquestionable that, out of about forty members of the corporation, the majority upon each of the twenty grand juries, in the ten years specified, have been composed in constant and regular succession.

Have you examined this return laid before the House, of the grand jury presentments of the city of Dublin?—I have.

Can you state whether, in the period of ten years to which you have now directed the attention of the Committee, there appear many instances in which the individuals to whom you have alluded as members of the grand juries, have also been persons receiving presentments from those grand juries?—In a great number of instances, it constantly occurs.

Do you know whether any of those individuals are also public accountants before the

Mr. John M^cMullen.

(30 April.)

the grand jury, and are to account to the grand jury for the expenditure of public money?—They are unquestionably so.

What do you mean by accountants?—Persons who account for money which has been previously presented to them by the grand jury.

Will you turn to page 108; you will see a presentment for carrying into effect the building of a bridewell of 1,050*l.*; to whom is that presentment made?—To Aldermen Exshaw, Darly, Archer, Cash, and Nugent; and to Francis Hamilton and John Tudor, sheriffs-peers.

Are you acquainted with those two latter gentlemen?—Not personally.

Are they members of the corporation of the city of Dublin?—Unquestionably; one of them has since become an alderman, and the other is a magistrate of police, elected by the corporation.

Mr. White is named there as being governor of the house of correction, to whom a presentment of 150*l.* is made?—He is.

Are you aware whether he is a member of the corporation?—I believe him to be a member of the corporation, a sheriff's-peer, and married to the widow of the late Alderman Hutton.

In point of fact, with respect to the annual payment of 1,000*l.* was not that to pay government for what they laid out?—I believe the sum expended by government has not yet been repaid by the grand jury.

Do you know who had the control of the expenditure of that money?—I believe government had the control of its original expenditure.

Then a very considerable number of persons who appeared upon the face of that return as receiving presentments, are persons who appear upon the face of the return as being also members of the grand jury?—Unquestionably.

Jovis, 1° die Maii, 1823.

Mr. John M^cMullen, again called in; and Examined.

(1 May.)

TO whom are the presentments made to which you alluded in Michaelmas term 1820, for white washing and painting?—To Mr. Charles Thorp.

Is that gentleman a member of the corporation?—He is the present high sheriff of Dublin.

Can you inform the Committee who are the present officers receiving salaries from the grand jury of the city of Dublin?—There is, first, the secretary of the grand jury.

Who is that gentleman?—Mr. Alexander Montgomery; the next is the treasurer of public money, Mr. William Darley; the public accountant, Mr. Daniel Hutton; inspector of prisons, the Reverend P. R. Gamble; protestant chaplain, the Reverend Thomas Gamble; dissenting chaplain, the Reverend James Horner; Roman catholic chaplain, the Reverend Lawrence Morrissy; physician to prisons, Doctor William Harty; surgeon to ditto, Mr. Alexander Read; Architect to ditto, Mr. H. R. Baker; gaoler of Newgate, Mr. Frederick Bourne; deputy gaoler of ditto, Mr. Robert Gilbert; keeper of Smithfield penitentiary, Mr. D. E. Marston; governor of Richmond bridewell, Mr. Thomas Purden; deputy governor of ditto, Mr. R. Wilson.

Are those gentlemen, generally speaking, gentlemen connected with the corporation of the city of Dublin?—Yes, I think they are.

Is Mr. William Darley of the family of the alderman?—He is brother to Alderman Darley.

Is Doctor Harty a relation of the alderman of that name?—He is brother to the alderman of that name, and brother-in-law to Alderman M'Kenny.

Is Mr. Read, the surgeon, of the family of the late Alderman Read?—I have been told he is son-in-law to Mr. Long, the police magistrate.

Are you aware of any Act of Parliament, authorizing the appointment of a public accountant for the city of Dublin?—I am not; but I believe there is such an Act.

Do you know what are the duties of that public officer?—As far as I am informed, his duty is to examine the accounts of the treasurer and grand jury.

Has there been any considerable increase in the salaries of the public officers of the grand jury?—There has been in some instances recently.

Can you give any instances to that effect?—The salaries of the inspector and of the physician, were augmented in the year 1822, from 300*l.* to 400*l.* a year.

Can

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Can you state to the Committee, the increase of presentments made within any given number of years to the clerk of the peace and the clerk of the crown of the city of Dublin?—The increase of the emoluments of the clerks of the peace and of the crown has recently been very considerable.

What has been the increase since the year 1801?—In the year 1801, the emoluments of the clerks of the peace, paid out of the grand jury cess, were 693 *l.* 8 *s.* 6 *d.*

What were they in 1811, and what in 1821?—In 1811, 1,278 *l.* 1 *s.* 4 *d.* and in 1821, 1,750 *l.* 17 *s.* 2 *d.* and in 1822, 1,954 *l.* 16 *s.* 6 *d.*

What has been the increase of presentments to the sheriffs?—In the year 1801, the presentments for fees to the sheriff, amounted to 15 *l.* 5 *s.* 4 *d.*; in 1811, 153 *l.* 4 *s.*; in 1821, 343 *l.* 1 *s.* 9 *d.*; and in 1822, 427 *l.* 10 *s.*

Are you aware, whether the keeper of the sheriff's prison derives emoluments to any considerable extent, from the prison itself, beyond this amount of presentment?—The keeper derives emoluments to a considerable extent, from the rent of rooms in the prison.

Do you mean, derives or is entitled to, because there is a great deal of difference?—I do not perceive the difference; I am not aware of the nature of his title; but I am aware of the fact that he derives those emoluments.

Are you aware of any presentments which have been made, and which excited discussion in the court, with respect to the repairs of that prison?—I have heard of such presentment and such discussion.

Can you state to the Committee what you have heard on that subject?—I have heard it stated, that the court objected to some presentments for the repairs of that prison, and intimated that it ought to be kept in repair from the revenue arising out of it.

Is the salary of the treasurer to the grand jury increased?—It has been gradually advanced during the last forty years.

How much has it increased from the year 1781, to the present period?—In the year 1781, it was only 25 *l.* In the present year the salary is 300 *l.* for his services as treasurer of the grand jury, and 150 *l.* for his services to the commissioners of wide streets; both of which sums are included in the presentments of the grand jury.

Was there any additional sum granted to the treasurer, on account of the tax, called the Anna Liffey cess?—There was an additional salary granted to him on that account, of 50 *l.* yearly.

Has that tax now ceased?—That tax ceased, I believe, about three years ago.

Are you aware, whether there has been any reduction in the salary of the treasurer in consequence of the cessation of those duties?—The salary of the treasurer on that account, was not reduced until Michaelmas term last.

Observing that the duties of the treasurer embraced the two objects of grand jury cess and the wide street commissioners, has it ever occurred to you that it would be desirable to combine the whole of the collection of local taxes in one office, in Dublin, with a view to the safety of the public money and to the reduction of the expense of collection?—It has so occurred to me certainly.

Will you have the goodness to state to the Committee how it has occurred to you, that such an arrangement might best be carried into effect?—I think such an office might be established in Dublin, upon the plan which was adopted some years back, in the collection of the assessed taxes; payments to be made quarterly or half-yearly, allowing a discount as a premium for punctuality, and in lieu of the fees now paid to collectors; this discount should necessarily be, in the first instance, added to the amount of the taxes, and that portion of it which was not re-allowed upon payments, would go to defray the expense of such an establishment for the collection.

Have you reason to imagine that such an arrangement would give satisfaction to the different classes of the inhabitants of Dublin?—I am persuaded, that as far as it goes, it would give the most perfect satisfaction.

To all parties and classes?—To all parties.

Has there been any increase in the salary of the secretary to the grand jury?—The secretary to the grand jury has also obtained a gradual and extensive increase of salary.

Does there appear on the presentment sheet, any charge for this office from 1771 to 1781?—There does not.

What was the allowance in 1790?—40 *l.*

What was it in 1801?—50 *l.* and in 1811 and subsequently, 350 *l.*

Was

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Was any proportion of this seven fold augmentation intended for compensation for the management of the Anna Liffey tax?—Yes, 150 *l.*

Are you aware whether, since the cessation of the Anna Liffey tax, there has been any proportionate reduction in the emoluments of the secretary?—No such reduction took place until Michaelmas term last year.

When did that tax cease?—In 1820. In a recent publication by the officers of the prisons, all mention of the emoluments of the treasurer and of the secretary to the grand jury, under the head of Anna Liffey and of Wide-street taxes is suppressed, although paid out of the grand jury cess.

Has there been an increase in the salary of the inspector of prisons?—There has been an increase, about a year ago, of 100 *l.* per annum.

What was the salary of this office about the year 1790?—100 *l.* a year.

To what was it afterwards raised?—To 300 *l.*

At what is it at present fixed?—It is now fixed at 400 *l.*

Independently of this salary, is there any other allowance paid by presentments of the grand jury?—Exclusive of this there is a further allowance to this officer of 10 *l.* yearly, for distributing bread.

The Committee would wish to be informed respecting the expense of the medical officers and of the medicines, by the city of Dublin presentments; what was the levy under this head in the year 1771?—In the year 1771 the entire levy, under this head, was 20 guineas.

What was it in 1790?—298*l.* 16*s.* 3*d.*

In 1801?—518 *l.*

In 1811?—870 *l.* 7 *s.* 1 *d.*

In 1821?—1,059 *l.* 3 *s.* 11 *d.*

Does this include salaries to the hospital keepers and nurses?—It does not include the salaries of hospital keepers and nurses; in the last year the charge for medical attendance, medicines, nurses, hospital keepers and necessaries, appeared to me, from the most accurate calculations I could frame out of the presentment sheets, to be 1,414 *l*; but by a recent statement, on the part of the officers of the prisons, who have access to all the accounts, it appears that the real amount in the last year, was 1,544 *l.* 15 *s.* 7 *d.*

Can you inform the Committee what the expenditure in medicines and salaries has been in Mercer's hospital, Dublin?—In Mercer's hospital the expenditure in medicines and salaries, for the year 1820, was only 320 *l.*

What was the number of internal and external patients in 1820?—516 internal, and 18,196 external

Can you state what the salary of the physician was, at no very remote period?—At no very remote period the salary was only 100 *l.* per annum; it was recently raised to 300 *l.* and last year to 400 *l.*

Are you aware what the physician of the Cork-street fever hospital is paid?—In the Cork-street fever hospital, which is inconveniently situated, and where the duty is attended with great personal danger, the physician's salary is small.

What is it?—The physicians who attend that hospital, according to recent regulations, serve the first four years gratuitously, the fifth year they receive 25 *l.* the sixth 50 *l.* the seventh 75 *l.* and the eighth 100 *l.*; and according to the *present* regulations of the hospital, as soon as they have attained this maximum they must retire, to make way for others; and so great is the anxiety of the physicians of Dublin for practice and consequent improvement, that the canvass, whenever a vacancy occurs, is extremely active, and the candidates numerous.

Are you aware of what may have been the number of patients admitted in any one year to the Cork-street fever hospital?—The number of patients admitted into the Cork-street fever hospital, in the year 1820, was 3,115.

Can you inform the Committee what the salary in the year 1790 was, which was paid to the surgeon of the prisons in Dublin?—It was only 40 *l.*

What is it at present?—Two hundred guineas.

Are you aware whether there are any important or laborious duties connected with the surgical department of the prisons?—I have reason to think there are no very laborious duties connected with the situation; quite the contrary.

Who is the apothecary of the prisons of Dublin?—The apothecary is Alexander Craven.

Seeing the name of Craven as one of the sheriff's peers who has been in the habit of serving upon the grand juries; can you inform the Committee whether that is the

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

the same gentleman, or of the same family, as the apothecary of the prisons?—He is the same individual.

How often within the last twenty years, has that gentleman attended the presenting grand juries?—In the ten years ending Michaelmas 1820, he served upon thirteen grand juries.

Are you aware how long that gentleman has been apothecary to the prisons of the city of Dublin?—I am not aware of the exact time, but I believe, for a considerable length of time.

Has he been more than those ten years?—I believe he has held the situation for the last twenty or thirty years.

Then if that gentleman has been apothecary of the prisons of Dublin, during the last ten years, he has been thirteen times, within that period, a party to the presentment for his own benefit?—Unquestionably.

What was the amount paid to the apothecary in the year 1821?—531*l.* 13*s.* 11*d.* and in 1822, 593*l.* 17*s.*

Can you inform the Committee what the entire charge for medical and surgical attendance and medicine, at Kilmainham in the county of Dublin, was for the year 1821?—101*l.* comprising a salary of 80*l.* to the gentleman who attends the prison, and discharges the duties both of physician and surgeon, and 21*l.* for medicines; in the succeeding half year, ending Easter 1822, the charge for medicines was only 6*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*

Has any mode occurred to your mind by which there could be a reduction in those medical charges?—It occurs to me, that if the situations of physician, surgeon and apothecary, were open to election, perhaps triennially, large savings would be effected and the duty performed with equal efficiency.

Are you aware that that suggestion of yours has been acted upon in any public establishment in the city of Dublin?—In the lying-in hospital the physician is elected septennially, and in that institution the regulation is found to be attended with advantage.

Is there any salary attached to it?—I believe not, he has apartments, coals, candles, &c.

What are the salaries to the chaplains of the prisons?—There are three chaplains at the prisons, at salaries of 100*l.* a year each; there was a further emolument to each of them of 10*l.* a year, for distributing bread, which upon application to the court of King's Bench, was refused at Michaelmas term last.

Who is the presbyterian or dissenting chaplain to the city of Dublin prisons?—The Rev. Mr. Horner.

Has he any other situation or emolument derived from the public in the city of Dublin?—He has a pension as a retired governor of the house of industry.

Are you aware whether there have been, during the time you have paid attention to the prisons of the city of Dublin, any considerable number of prisoners of dissenting persuasions, requiring the service of a dissenting chaplain?—I have reason to believe that the case occurs very seldom indeed, almost never.

Who is the catholic chaplain of the gaols of the city of Dublin?—The Rev. Mr. Morrissy.

Are you aware of any difficulty which has occurred with respect to that reverend gentleman, in the administration of his functions in the prisons?—I am.

Will you inform the Committee of any facts that have come to your knowledge on the subject?—I have been informed that he holds the situation in opposition to the authority of his ecclesiastical superiors, and that he is in consequence not attended to by the prisoners.

Are you aware whether this gentleman does, in point of fact, perform his sacred functions within the prison, and do the prisoners attend upon him?—I have been informed that he does attend the prison, but that the prisoners refuse to hear him, or attend to his instructions.

Are you acquainted with the state of the gaol of Newgate?—I have frequently visited the prison.

Do you know any thing of the average cost of the daily food of the prisoners?—I made inquiry very recently, and I was informed that the present dietary is confined to bread and milk; that each prisoner receives about two pounds of bread and one quart of milk daily; it was so stated to me by one of the inferior officers of the prison.

Can you inform the Committee what is the cost of the daily food of the pesoners?—Under those circumstances the average cost of the food of each prison would be about five-pence daily, or very nearly so, as the bread supplied by the contractor

Mr. John M'Mullen.
(1 May.)

contractor has not for some time back been worth more than three-halfpence per pound, and by the existing contract for the gaol milk, is at two-pence per quart.

If you are in possession of any document which will enable you to do so, will you inform the Committee what has been, during the last year, the daily expense of food for supporting the prisoners in the county gaol of Kent at Maidstone?—For the quarter from Easter sessions to Midsummer sessions 1821, the average cost of the daily food of each prisoner was fourpence halfpenny, and three quarters of a farthing; and from Midsummer to Michaelmas sessions 1821, the average cost was four-pence and the fourteenth part of a penny; from Michaelmas to Epiphany the average cost was three-pence three farthings and three-tenths of a farthing, and in the quarter from Epiphany to Easter 1822, the average cost was three-pence halfpenny and one eighth of a penny.

Therefore, in every instance the Committee are to understand, that the expense for food in the gaol of the county of Kent, has been less than the expense for food in the gaols of the city of Dublin?—Certainly.

What is the average number of committals to Newgate at present?—About 2,000; last year the number was 2,135, that number includes, however, not only those who are committed for trial, but also those sent to Newgate as to a house of correction for short terms, under summary convictions by a magistrate; from the 1st of January to the 22d of April, the day on which I visited the prison, the committals were 740.

What is the average number of prisoners and convicts at present confined in Newgate?—I extracted from the books of the prison an account, to show the number it at present contains, which I will produce to the Committee; the average is 275 daily, and by striking a similar average, it would appear that about forty-three of those were convicts under rule of transportation.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

" Number of prisoners confined in Newgate, stated at intervals from the 1st of January to the 15th of April 1823.

		Totals.
January	1.	312
–	15.	289
February	1.	301
–	14.	268
March	1.	214
–	15.	248
April	1.	310
–	15.	255
	8	2197
Daily average about		275

Prisoners under rule of transportation included in the above.

		Males.	Females.
January	1.	52	3
–	15.	57	4
February	1.	61	4
–	14.	64	5
March	1.	10	6
–	15.	16	6
April	1.	19	6
–	15.	24	9
		303	43
		43	
	8	346	
Daily average		43	

Taking the average number of prisoners as you have stated it at 275, what would be the amount of the charge for the subsistence of the prisoners?—About 2,100 *l.* yearly.

Mr.
John McMullen.

(1 May.)

What is the number of prisoners in the city bridewell?—I have not lately visited the bridewell, but the governor informed me a short time ago, that they never exceed 300, and that they are generally under that number.

Are you aware how the expense of food in Richmond bridewell stands, as compared with the expense of food in the gaol of Newgate?—The general expense ought to be considerably less, inasmuch as it is reduced by the earnings of the prisoners. It was stated to me by the governor a short time ago, that those earnings amounted in the year ending October 1822, to 606*l.* 6*s.*; the expenses of that gaol have, however, hitherto been enormous; in the half year provided for at Michaelmas 1820, according to the most accurate calculations I have been able to extract from this account, the total expenditure must have been about 5,500*l.* or at present at the rate of nearly 11,000*l.* per annum; I have made the calculations with as much accuracy as is in my power, and I will beg leave to produce it to the Committee.

[*It was delivered in and read as follows:*]

" Expenses of the Richmond Bridewell for half a year, as presented by the Grand Jury at Michaelmas Term 1820.

For the Bridewell exclusively.	£.	*s.*	*d.*
Governor	150	0	0
Rent	11	4	6
D°	22	16	6
Milk	29	11	9
Taskmasters, &c.	100	0	0
Salaries	275	0	0
Food and necessaries	491	11	3
Various articles	182	10	0
Ironmongery	117	10	6
Brushes	20	4	0
Mason and bricklayer's work	59	8	7
Other works	565	10	8
Painting and scouring	11	6	7
Other works	416	19	7
Salary to governor	150	0	0
D° to officers	236	0	0
Taskmasters	100	0	0
Drying closet	235	11	0
Coals	192	0	0
Clerk to the commissioners of bridewell	15	0	0
Nurse	20	0	0
Water	5	0	0
Presentment for building	1,050	0	0
	£. 4,457	4	11

Joint Expenses for Newgate, the Bridewell, and Sheriff's Prison.

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
Inspector of prisons	155	0	0
Physician	150	0	0
Potatoes, straw and milk	300	0	0
Apothecary	10	0	0
D°	62	15	1
D°	24	16	6
D°	95	4	8
D°	65	0	7
Herrings	62	10	0
Architect	28	8	9
Surgeon	113	15	0
Two chaplains	110	0	0
Bread	1,076	0	9
D°	100	0	0
Necessaries, &c.	331	9	2
	£. 2,585	0	6

Estimating

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Estimating the proportion of expense incurred on account of the bridewell, at two-fifths of this sum, the amount referable to that prison will be - - - - - -	£. 1,034	0	2
Expenses incurred, exclusively for the use of the bridewell, as previously stated - - - - - -	4,457	4	11
Total for the half year - - -	£. 5,491	5	1

Do those expenses include alterations of prisons, and every thing?—Every thing.

Taking the facts as you have stated them, what would you compute the annual expense of food alone for the prisoners to be, in Newgate and at the bridewell?—At about 4,000 *l.* a year.

Are you aware, what is the amount presented for those purposes?—I am not aware of the amount presented, for the purpose of food, it is always mixed up with the other presentments; the average amount of all the grand jury presentments for the last three years, is about 25,500 *l.*

Can you account for that large increase of expenditure, by any mere reference to the expense of maintaining the prisoners?—I certainly cannot.

To what other causes would you attribute that large increase of expenditure?—I have already stated that, exclusive of the increase of the expense owing to the extension of the recorder's jurisdiction, and the large sums annually applied to the support of convicted criminals, I did believe there was great want of economy in the disbursement of the money, levied under the authority of the grand jury: I cannot attribute a large proportion of the increase in question to any other cause than to this want of economy.

Are you able to inform the Committee, in what departments you conceive such want of economy to exist?—I have already referred to the medical department, in which I think it is more evident than in any other.

By the medical department, are the Committee to understand the expenses of salaries to the physician and surgeon, and the payments to the apothecary?—Certainly, all charges incurred by attendance, and provisions for sick criminals.

Are there any other instances of want of economy, to which you would direct the attention of the Committee?—The salaries of various officers appear to be unnecessarily large; that of the inspector, I have already stated, has been recently increased from 300 *l.* to 400 *l.* a circumstance which has certainly excited considerable attention.

In what year was the increase of that officer's salary made?—In Michaelmas term 1822.

During the early part of that period, were the expenses of living in the city of Dublin, higher or lower, than they are at present?—They were unquestionably higher; and as far as I can judge, I should be induced to conclude, that 300 *l.* at present, would be fully equal in the maintenance of a family, to 400 *l.* during a long period prior to 1816 or 1817.

Therefore, in point of fact, you conceive that the inspector of prisons, receives a salary in effect, exceeding in value by 200 *l.* a year, what he received at the early part of that time?—That is the conclusion at which I arrive.

That in obtaining a command over the comforts and necessaries of life 300 *l.* a year, would go further than 400 *l.* did at the former part of that time?—That is my opinion.

Can you state any facts respecting the office of inspector?—He is appointed by the grand jury, and his province is to see that all contracts are faithfully and correctly executed; it will, I think, appear to the Committee as wholly nugatory, that an officer who is appointed by the grand jury, and whose salary is regulated at their pleasure, should control the receipt of supplies for the furnishing of which persons who constantly serve as grand jurors, as well as the friends and dependents of the existing grand jury, are almost uniformly the contractors. Large sums are also constantly presented to this officer for the purchase of clothing and necessaries for convicts, and for the necessary expenses of the gaol of Newgate; to pay the salaries of under gaolers and turnkeys, duties which it will appear this officer ought to control not to perform; and with respect to which, it is perfectly clear that the agent of the grand jury, and the inspector of the prisons is under the existing practice, in such cases, one and the same person.

Can you give any information to the Committee, with regard to the supply of stationery for the use of the grand jury?—The amount in the last year was no less than 344 *l.* 8 *s.* 9 *d.* for the use of the grand juries and the sessions-house.

Supplied by whom?—By Alderman Exshaw.

Who is Alderman Exshaw?—The city stationer.

Are you aware whether this supply is furnished by contract, or whether any system of control is exercised over the prices of the articles furnished?—I am aware that it is not furnished by contract, and that no control over the prices exists, except on the part of the grand juries.

Alderman Exshaw is a constant attendant upon those grand juries?—He is.

Do you know whether, in any one instance, there has been any deduction made by a grand jury from the bills for stationery sent in by Alderman Exshaw?—I never heard of such a deduction, although I am aware of objections having been made by individual grand jurors against the prices charged, as being very exorbitant.

Are there any other circumstances to which you can direct the attention of the Committee, which may contribute to this want of economy, which you attribute to the grand juries?—I have every reason to believe that the contracts are not in general judiciously managed, and that the competition to which they ought to open the way is not productive of that advantage which the public should derive from it.

On what circumstances do you form your opinion?—I form this opinion from my acquaintance with the trading classes of society in Dublin, and my perfect knowledge that the presenting grand juries of Dublin possess in no degree whatever the confidence of the inhabitants. Many even of the members of the corporation, express themselves decidedly hostile to the present system, as open to all kinds of secret and partial influence. The period during which the grand juries are assembled is also so limited, and the members of them are so uniformly persons who have other important pursuits to attend to, that the fulfilment of contracts, and the execution of works, is necessarily subjected to the control of inferior officers; from whose decision, if it should be influenced by caprice or by any more improper motive, redress must always be obtained with great trouble and difficulty. Under such circumstances, I believe that persons in trade are not in general anxious to propose for contracts, and that the public in consequence lose the benefit which ought to accrue from that mode of obtaining the supplies for the prisons.

Have you any doubt that, if there were fair officers appointed, in whom the public at large could feel confidence, and if the contracts and the contract system were fully open to the whole trade of Dublin, that a very considerable reduction of the expense would necessarily take place?—I am clearly of opinion, that under such an improved system, and the abolition of the monopoly which at present exists with respect to the nomination of grand jurors, that great advantages would be derived by the public in the disbursement of the money.

Are you acquainted with many of the individuals who are at present contractors for the supply of the prisons of Dublin under the grand jury authority?—I am not personally acquainted with many of them.

Do you know who they are?—They are by no means in general persons of great respectability, or known as merchants or traders in the city of Dublin.

Are they, generally speaking, connected or unconnected with the corporation?—They are, as far as I can judge, almost uniformly relations, or dependents, or intimate friends of the persons who serve upon the grand juries.

Are you aware, whether any charge in the way of rent or money payment of any kind is taken in the gaol of Newgate from criminal prisoners, in consideration of removing them to any other part of the prison, than that intended for criminal prisoners?—I have reason to believe, that such a practice did even recently exist, but I am informed that it has ceased.

Can you give the Committee any information with respect to the charges connected with the sessions-house of the city of Dublin?—They form a very considerable item in the grand jury presentments.

Can you give any instance of very considerable charge, as connected with the administration of justice in the sessions-house?—It appears, that the common cryer received in the last year 188 *l.* in lieu of fees on prisoners discharged, exclusive of his regular salary of 48 *l.* per year; I am aware that this statement has been denied, but I am positive as to the fact.

Have you any observations to make with reference to those payments of officers, by the fluctuating and uncertain amount of fees, as compared with a fixed payment in the shape of salary?—It is my decided conviction, and I am persuaded that it is universally the public opinion, that the payment by fees of officers permanently employed

Mr. John M'Mullen. (1 May.)

employed in courts of justice, and especially in those possessing a criminal jurisdiction should not be suffered to exist, as it may lead to the most dangerous and corrupt practices.

What was the entire amount of fees for various officers, upon the conviction and discharge of prisoners in the last year?—It amounted in the last year, to so large a sum as 2,606 *l.* 10 *s.* 8 *d.* paid out of the grand jury cess, and exclusive of any other emoluments to which those officers might be entitled from any other source.

What was the amount for stationery for the use of the sessions-house, during the last year?—The amount for stationery for the use of the sessions-house last year, was 57 *l.* 19 *s.* 6 *d.*

What is the present internal state of the gaol of Newgate, or what was it when you visited it?—There appears to be every attention on the part of the governor, to render the internal condition of Newgate respectable; but it appears to me, from the original formation of the prison, that in its present crowded state, he never can succeed in rendering it either regular, or in fact what a prison ought to be; I examined some of the cells in which the convicts sleep, they are eleven feet by seven and an half, and apparently nine or ten feet high; in each of those cells there are generally six prisoners confined; the gaoler stated that there were sometimes more.

Did you make any observations with respect to the state of the female prisoners and the children in the prison of Newgate?—The state of the female prisoners appears to be as bad as can possibly be imagined; convicts under rule of transportation or of imprisonment, and prisoners committed for trial, are all mingled together; the matron complains, that it is quite impossible to produce any regularity or reformation, in consequence of the introduction of offenders every day, who derange all that has been previously done, and demoralize the whole; the female prisoners, she stated, often feigned illness, in order to get into the hospital, as the windows look into the yard where the male convicts are confined; I saw in the prison two children if I may so call them, committed for trial, one apparently ten and the other eleven or twelve years of age, mingled with persons committed for the most serious offences, and of the most depraved character.

Are you aware, that the interposition of government has lately taken place, with a view to the reform of the prisons in the city of Dublin, and a new classification of the offenders?—I am aware that efforts have been made by the government to that effect; but while the present system continues that convicted criminals sentenced to terms of imprisonment under six months, are sent to Newgate, and that those under rule of transportation are confined in it, it is quite imposible, that that gaol can ever be otherwise than crowded and irregular.

Do you mean to state to the Committee, that prisoners convicted and under rule for transportation, are supported at the expense of the citizens of Dublin?—I do; they are not only supported, but they have been hitherto clothed, previously to their transportation, at the expense of the citizens.

Is there no allowance made by government for the expense of such convicts food and clothing?—There is none that I ever heard of; but I have been informed, that the charge for clothing is henceforward to cease, as far as relates to convicts under rule of transportation, but in that particular case only.

Can you state any instances in which individuals have been, for a considerable length of time, kept in the gaol of Newgate, and supported at the local expense of the city of Dublin, being under rule of transportation?—The case frequently occurs; on the 22d of April the gaoler discharged two convicts under rule of transportation, one of whom had been confined above one year, and the other above two years.

Can you inform the Committee of the amount of emoluments of the gaoler of Newgate in salary and fees?—The salary of the gaoler of Newgate is 400 *l.* a year, and he receives a fee on prisoners taken out for trial of 3 *s.* 4 *d.* each.

Will you state the annual amount of those fees and emoluments?—He represented to me that his fees and emoluments at present were about 600 *l.* a year.

Does the gaoler of Newgate reside within the prison?—He resides in a house adjoining the prison, but not having any internal communication with the prison, as I am informed.

Is it a house forming part of the establishment of Newgate, or is it a house maintained at private expense?—I am not informed as to this particular fact.

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Does he hold any other office besides that of gaoler of Newgate?—I am not aware of any other; he was an officer in the army; but whether now on half pay or not, I have never heard.

Are you aware how often the present recorder sits for the trial of prisoners?—Once a week.

How often did his predecessor sit?—Once a fortnight.

What would you imagine to be the effect of this alteration of practice upon the expense of maintaining prisoners in Newgate?—It would appear to be very considerable; it must operate as a considerable reduction, inasmuch as the prisoners committed for trial are kept in prison on an average only half the time they formerly were.

Therefore, the Committee ought not to estimate the increased expense of the prisons of Dublin merely by the increased number of committals during any given number of years?—I certainly think so.

The alteration of the practice by the recorder must operate as a reduction to that expense?—It must reduce the expense one-half, as far as relates to the maintenance of persons committed for trial.

Can you give the Committee any view of the comparative expense of the administration of the criminal law in the county of Dublin, as compared with the expenses of a similar nature in the city?—I have prepared a statement of the expense of the administration of the criminal law in the county of Dublin for the year 1820, as raised by grand jury presentments; it amounts in that year to 3,860*l.* 9*s.* 8*d.* In the same year the grand jury presentments for the parish of Saint Mary, in the city of Dublin, amounted to 3,835*l.* 7*s.* 5*d.* exclusive of the arrears demanded by the treasurer, 1,289*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.*

Can you distinguish what portion of that parochial assessment related to criminal law?—Of that parochial assessment of 3,860*l.* about one-tenth part was applicable to purposes distinct from the criminal law.

Can you state what was the total amount of the grand jury presentments for the administration of the criminal law of the city?—In the year 1771, the amount was 1,453*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*; in the year 1781, 3,278*l.* 19*s.* 10*d.*; in 1790, 4,784*l.* 13*s.*; in 1801, 7,262*l.* 6*s.*; in 1811, 13,851*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.*; in 1821, 25,053*l.* 9*s.* 1*d.*

What heads of expenditure do you include, when you state the expenses of the administration of the criminal law?—The safe keeping and maintenance of prisoners, the prosecution of nuisances, and all offences which the law regards as criminal, and the punishment of offenders.

Will you state more specifically, the heads of expenditure which you include?—The clerks of the peace and of the crown, the sheriffs, the treasurer to the grand jury, the secretary to the grand jury, inspector of prisons, medical officers and medicines, chaplains, collector of the public money, building, repairs and maintenance of gaols; the proportion of public money which passes through the public officers for any other purpose than that of administering the criminal law, is so very small, that it is impossible to make any distinction.

You include the expenses of the sessions house?—Yes.

And of the sheriffs prison?—Yes; they are so mixed up with the other expenses, that it is impossible to distinguish them; a principal use too of the sheriffs prison at present is, for the confinement of insolvent debtors remanded for fraud, who cannot be looked upon otherwise than as criminals; the law would certainly seem to consider them as such.

Referring to the expenses under the heads of roads and bridges, are you aware of any parish in the city of Dublin, within the jurisdiction of the grand jury, which has not contributed for some time past to the grand jury cess?—The parish of Saint Mary's, Donnybrook, which is especially benefitted by the expenditure of public money, under this head has, from some cause unexplained to me, contributed in no degree for more than a year towards the grand jury cess.

How are the roads on the south side of the city of Dublin repaired?—There are no turnpikes on the south side of the city of Dublin; the roads are in part repaired by the produce of a house tax of 2*s.* in the pound on the value of each house, levied under Acts of Parliament, procured by the inhabitants of those baronies at their own expense, as a voluntary commutation for turnpikes.

Are you aware of any memorial being presented from the parish of Saint Mary's, to which you belong, in the year 1819, on the subject of the grand jury taxes of the city of Dublin?—I am aware that such a memorial was presented to the Lord Lieutenant.

Does

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Does that memorial state any inconveniences connected with the present mode of appointing grand juries?—It does.

[*A Copy of the Memorial was delivered in, and read as follows:*]

" To His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, &c. &c.

" The memorial of the householders of the parish of Saint Mary, in the city of Dublin, in public vestry assembled, on Monday 11th January 1819; most humbly sheweth,—

" That your memorialists beg leave to approach your Excellency with the warmest sentiments of respect and confidence, and with the utmost deference to represent to your Excellency a great and increasing grievance under which they labour, in common with all the other householders of this city.

" Memorialists humbly submit to your Excellency, that one of the local taxes of this city, called " Grand Jury Cess," has progressively increased beyond what would be sufficient for all the necessary purposes which the law intended, and which impost, in addition to all the other local taxes, bears heavily and oppressively upon them.

" That the manner in which the accounts of this tax have been kept, is irregular and unsatisfactory; that the system, as now practised, is not calculated to prevent frauds or to correct abuses; and further, that part of the sums collected as grand jury cess, and brought to the treasurer's office, are constantly applied to purposes neither sanctioned nor presented by such grand juries, or in any manner brought into the accounts.

" That this exorbitant and illegal taxation is the result, as your memorialists humbly conceive, of the partial and unfair mode which invariably prevails in impanelling the presenting grand juries, inasmuch as those juries are taken from a limited panel, composed exclusively of the leading members of the corporation of this city, many of whom occupy other public situations, as those of aldermen, managers of the Metal Main Tax, police magistrates, contractors with public establishments, commissioners of public boards, &c. and several of whom, in discharging the duties of grand jurors, thus sit in judgment on their own accounts as well as upon other accounts, and charges immediately connected with some of their permanent employments, for doing the duties of which they are amply compensated.

" That however upright or exemplary the conduct of these persons might be, memorialists humbly submit that the important functions of grand jurors ought not to be monopolized by them or by any other class of persons; memorialists being humbly of opinion, that by the constitution, those functions should be occupied by persons indifferently taken from amongst all who are duly qualified, of which description there are in this city, as memorialists believe, some thousands.

" Your memorialists would humbly submit to your Excellency, that this extensive power of taxation and patronage, (for those juries have the appointment and removal of all persons employed in the collection of this tax), thus vested in the same men, term after term and year after year, must create in them an undue desire for its continuance, and prevent that wholesome circumspection and control which a succession of different persons would insure.

" Memorialists further submit, that this mode of forming the grand juries is not likely to be abandoned or altered so long as the sheriffs and the sub-sheriff, whose province it is to impanel all juries, are solely under the influence and control of the said corporation, consisting of about one hundred and fifty persons.

" And memorialists humbly state to your Excellency, their serious apprehension, that this practice of selecting juries from amongst a few, who are thus considered a privileged class above their fellow citizens, may operate most materially to affect the impartial administration of public justice, and is considered by your memorialists as an alarming innovation.

" May it therefore please your Excellency to take the matters herein into your early consideration, and to institute a commission solemnly to inquire into memorialists' humble complaint, on behalf of themselves and the other householders of the city of Dublin, or to relieve your memorialists in such other manner as to your Excellency may seem meet;—and they will pray."

" Signed on behalf of the said meeting,

" *Charles Thorp,* } Churchwardens.
" *Richard Wright,* }

Who

Mr. John McMullen.

(1 May.)

Who is Mr. Charles Thorp, by whom that memorial is signed?—He is the present high sheriff of the city of Dublin.

What was the result of this memorial?—The Lord Lieutenant declined to interfere, and the treasurer to the grand jury thereupon instituted a suit against two of the individuals who had been instrumental in laying the case before his Excellency; these proceedings, however, upon a more mature consideration of his case, he thought proper to withdraw.

Who were the individuals against whom he instituted these proceedings; were they the persons who signed the memorial?—By no means; they were instituted against two householders of the parish, Mr. Kertland and Mr. Frazer, who, as I have already stated, had exerted themselves in bringing the case under the notice of the Irish government.

You have stated the inspector of prisons to have had a salary of 100*l.* a year, in the year 1790?—Yes.

What was the number of gaols in the city of Dublin, in the year 1790, which he had to visit and inspect?—I believe the gaol of Newgate and the bridewell in James's-street.

What was about the number of committals in the year 1790?—I have no document from which I can answer the question.

Are you aware how many gaols are now under the management and superintendence of the inspector?—He superintends the gaol of Newgate, the Richmond bridewell, the Smithfield penitentiary, the sheriff's prison, and the city marshalsea.

Then he has now to inspect five prisons, when in the year 1790 he had to inspect one?—I apprehend that any compensation for the duty which he discharges at the city marshalsea, ought never to have been a legal charge against the inhabitants of Dublin; all the expenses of that prison should be paid out of the funds of the corporation.

In point of fact, he now performs the labours and the duties attached to five prisons, in the city of Dublin?—I believe so; but I consider it very material to observe, that of those five prisons, *three* are almost literally under one roof; with the intervention of the sessions house, they form but one range of building.

The number of prisoners in those five prisons amounting to about how many?—I suppose about 800 or 900, including the sheriff's prison.

Then do you conceive that for the increased duties of five prisons, and the increased duties arising from an increase from 150 to 900 prisoners, that he is entitled to any increase of emolument?—He may, but not in the proportion in which his salary has been increased.

Are you aware of the duties he has to perform, in each of those prisons?—I am aware that the duty is considerable, and if it were discharged according to the letter of the law, I think it would require as much time as one individual could devote to it. I am aware, however, also, that the present inspector is the curate of one of the poorest and most populous parishes in Dublin, and I think it impossible that, consistent with the discharge of his clerical functions, he could devote to the superintendence of five prisons, a portion of his time which would entitle him to so large a compensation as 400*l.* a year.

You admit, however, that his duties require his whole time, are you aware of any neglect of those duties?—I am not aware of any particular neglect as to superintendence, but, if I understand the Act of Parliament upon the subject correctly, he ought, twice in every week, to visit every cell in each of those prisons, which I consider it would, under his peculiar circumstances, be almost impossible for him to do.

Do you think he does it?—I do not know.

What reason have you to suppose that he does not do it?—I will not assert that he does not do it; I have only stated, that consistent with his clerical functions, I think it next to impossible he should do it.

You have visited Richmond penitentiary?—Not recently.

When did you visit it?—I have not been in the Richmond penitentiary for a considerable time back.

Then you cannot give an account to the Committee of the state of that prison?—I cannot.

Are you aware that the salary of the inspector was only 300*l.* a year, to the year 1822?—It was only 300*l.*

Are you aware that in the year 1817, the Smithfield penitentiary was added to his previous labours?—I believe such was the fact.

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Are you aware, that he performed the extra labour of that prison, from 1817 to 1822, without any increased emolument?—I suppose so.

Are you aware, or do you believe, that in the course of that time he made several applications to the grand jury for an increase of salary; do you believe that?—I do not doubt it.

Do you believe that those were complied with or rejected?—I believe that they were rejected, and I think most properly.

Are you aware of the circumstances under which the increase took place? – It has been stated, by the officers of the prisons, that the increase took place under an arrangement previously made with the judges of the King's Bench.

Are the Committee to understand then, that there was any thing of private collusion between him and the judges of the King's Bench?—I should be the last person in the world to make any such imputation; but it always struck me, that such imputation was conveyed by the publication to which I allude.

Then in point of fact, do not you believe, that he, in consequence of the refusal of the grand jury, presented a memorial to the judges of the court of King's Bench?—I suppose so; but I know nothing of the fact.

That the judges took it into their consideration, and ordered the grand jury to increase his salary?—I believe that they sanctioned it.

Did they not suggest it?—I am not aware of that fact; and I am very far from supposing or insinuating that they did.

Have not you this moment stated, that it was in consequence of a previous communication with the judges?—I presume such communication must have come from the inspector, not from the judges.

Do you believe, or can you form an opinion, whether the judges in open court, did not represent to the grand jury, their opinion of the inadequacy of that salary?—I never heard the fact stated.

Are you aware of what the county of Dublin grand jury pay their inspector?—I have been informed, that he receives 200 *l.* as inspector, and 60 *l.* as chaplain.

He has only one gaol to attend to?—I believe only one.

Can you say, what may be the average number of inmates in that prison?—I believe about 130 or 150.

Then one prison, containing 130, paying its inspector 260 *l.* a year; do you conceive that an inspector, having five different prisons in different parts, remotely situated from each other, and a thousand inmates so disproportionate a payment?—Compared with the payment of the inspector of the gaol of Kilmainham, the sum does appear disproportionate; but the payment to the inspector of the gaol of Kilmainham, appears to me excessive; I ground my opinion on this circumstance, that the physician who attends that gaol, and whose duty I should suppose to be nearly equal to that of the inspector, receives only 80 *l.* a year.

Are you aware that the official duty, as prescribed by law, is precisely the same in point of days attendance, as that of the inspector?—I am aware of the fact; and it is upon that circumstance, that I ground the opinion I have just expressed.

The inspector, when he goes to the prison, is bound by law to inspect every cell, apartment or place of confinement in the prison, is he not?—I understand so.

Do you mean, that the physician is bound to inspect every apartment and cell in the prison, whenever he goes there?—I do not.

How many days is the inspector bound to attend at Newgate?—Twice in each week.

Is he not bound to examine, and to hear the complaint of any person in that prison?—I believe he is bound to hear complaints.

At each examination?—Yes.

Is he not bound to examine the provisions, and to regulate the dietary?—I believe so; he can, however, only do it occasionally.

Is he not bound to receive weekly reports from the medical officers, and make reports from them, and to inspect generally?—I believe so.

Is he bound to make out returns at the commencement of each term, one for the King's Bench, and another for the grand jury?—I have heard so.

Has he not the charge under his own management and control of all bedding, clothing, furniture and all necessaries for distribution among the prisoners?—He has not the charge of them while they are in use; he has the charge of the primary distribution of them.

Then, if such be his duties, do not you conceive that the increase from one prison to five, and from 150 prisoners to 1,000 prisoners, must occupy the entire of his

Mr. John McMullen (1 May.)

his time?—I think it should occupy the entire of his time; but I did not assert that the increase was from 150 to 1,000; nor has the advance of his salary from 300*l.* to 400*l.* any reference to that increase.

You have stated that he is the curate of St. Michan's parish?—He is.

Are you aware that it is in that capacity that he is by Act of Parliament appointed to this situation?—I am aware of it.

Are you aware that he has no connection, either directly or indirectly, with any members of the corporation, and that, till he became inspector of the gaol, he was totally unconnected with them; are you aware of any connection ever having subsisted between them?—I am not aware that, previous to his holding the appointment, he had any connection with them.

Was it competent to them, by law, if the grand jury had been so inclined, to appoint any other person than the curate of that parish?—He has the preference; I never heard that they were compelled to elect him; but I have always understood that he was entitled to a preference.

In point of fact, from your own observation, have you any reason to suppose that he neglects his duties as inspector of prisons?—I have no reason to know that he neglects the inspection of the prisons.

On the contrary, do not you really believe that his conduct as inspector is exemplary?—I really could not pretend to express an opinion on the subject.

Have you been in the habit of visiting the different gaols?—Occasionally.

In the course of your own observation, did it ever occur to you to see any thing which would lead you to suppose that he neglects his duty?—No, not from my observation.

That being the case, does it not justify you in believing that he performs his duty?—I have no reason to doubt that the duty is not performed; but, at the same time, I think it impossible that he could perform it according to the letter of the Act, or so as to entitle him to a salary of 400*l.* a year.

Then your only reason for having any doubt upon the subject, arises from the extent of the attention the Act of Parliament requires?—My reason for doubting it arises, in the first place, from the great extent of the population of the parish of which he is curate, and which, I should think, demands his attention as the primary part of his duty.

Do you look upon it, that a sum of 400*l.* a year is an exorbitant salary for a person necessarily receving a college education, and devoting the whole of his time, as you say it requires, to the duties of inspector of prisons?—I think there are many persons equally competent who would be glad to undertake the office, and would discharge it equally, if not more efficiently, for his original salary of 300*l.* or even 200*l.* a year. I have not said that he devotes the whole of his time to it; I know that he ought not to do so.

The question is, whether a salary of 400*l.* a year for a clergyman of literary education, and who has taken a degree at college, is an exorbitant salary?—I think a salary of 300*l.* a year would be sufficient for a gentleman possessing all those qualifications; and I think also, that those qualifications are wholly unnecessary in the inspector of a gaol.

The Act of Parliament, however, gives a preference to the curate of the parish?—I am aware of that circumstance; and it is one of those circumstances which, I conceive, calls most decided for remedy.

Then the remedy must be in the Act of Parliament, and not in the grand jury?—In both; and therefore we are first seeking a remedy from Parliament.

Do you conceive that the Act of Parliament remaining as it is, the increase of salary to the inspector of prisons has, or has not, been warranted by the necessity of the case?—I think it is quite unwarranted by the necessity of the case.

Do you know any gentleman who has been brought up at college, and is a curate, who lives upon less than that?—I know of many who have not 100*l.* a year, possessed of equal or superior qualifications.

The next increase of salary which you mention, was that of the physician?—Yes.

His salary has been increased to 400*l.* a year?—It has.

For that salary the physician is bound to attend each of those five prisons twice a week?—He is.

Those prisons are, some of them, inconveniently situated at a distance from each other?—One of them is at a considerable distance from the others.

Must he not prescribe for, and satisfy himself as to the state of all the sick, in those five prisons?—It is his duty to do so.

Do

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(1 May.)

Do you believe he performs that duty?—I have no doubt of it.

Are you aware of the sum that is paid to the physician of the county of Dublin gaol?—80*l.* per annum.

For one gaol?—Yes.

That gaol, of course, more healthy and airy than the Dublin prisons; than Newgate, for instance?—Not more so than the bridewell, I should think, nor so much so.

Than Newgate?—More healthy, possibly, than Newgate.

The description of prisoners that are committed to it, more healthy and vigorous, as generally coming from the country?—I think they are much the same.

Do you think that the prisoners of the city, generally speaking, are as healthy and strong a set of persons as the prisoners coming from the airy situations in the country?—Perhaps not quite so much so; but I do not think there can be any important difference.

Are you aware that the city prisoners are more than five times the number of the county prisoners?—I believe so.

Do you believe that they nearly equal ten times?—Probably about six times.

Then in the ordinary course of proceedings, and suppose the healthiness of the county and city to be equal, he has six times the duty to perform that the physician of the county of Dublin has?—Supposing the number of patients to be the same.

Has he not six times the number of patients, and five times the number of houses?—He has; but the distance which the physician of the gaol of Kilmainham, residing as he does in Dublin, has to traverse, I conceive to be nearly equal to the distance in the whole round of the city of Dublin gaols.

Which do you conceive is farthest from the centre of the city, to Kilmainham or to Richmond penitentiary?—I think Kilmainham considerably the farthest.

Do you conceive the distance greater from Newgate to Richmond penitentiary, or from Newgate to Kilmainham?—I conceive the distance from Newgate to Kilmainham the greatest.

What is the distance from the Smithfield penitentiary to Richmond bridewell?—Probably a mile and a half.

You have stated the proportion between what is paid to the physician of the Cork-street fever hospital and to the physician of the gaols?—I have.

How many physicians are there at the Cork-street institution?—I believe there are six, but the salaries paid to them all are not, collectively, equal to the salary paid to the physician to the prisons.

They attend in rotation?—They do.

Month about?—I believe so.

Then each physician has only two months attendance?—I suppose so.

Are you aware of any difference between the situation of a person attending a gaol and that of a person attending an hospital, in the public estimation; do you look upon hospital practice to be an introduction to private practice?—I look upon all medical practice to be improving, and consequently calculated to introduce the practitioner to other business.

Is not hospital practice looked to by medical men as leading in probability to private business?—I rather consider it as being looked to as a means of improvement.

Do not you think they look to it as an introduction to private business, and that they have that object in view in being made physicians to the hospital?—The fact may be so, but it never has occurred to me; I cannot see how it should introduce them to respectable families or to private practice.

Are you aware, or do you believe, that the circumstance of being physician to a gaol, owing to a prejudice on that subject, rather precludes him from private practice than introduces him to it?—I have never met with such an opinion.

Do you believe that no prejudice exists against gaol fevers and gaol distempers?—I think in the city of Dublin no such prejudice does exist, for I have heard it frequently stated that in the gaol of Newgate a case of fever scarcely ever exists.

Do you believe that the simple absence of a good cause precludes the likelihood and the possibility of prejudice existing?—The absence of cause does not preclude prejudice; if cause exists it is no longer prejudice.

Then, in point of fact, there may be prejudice though there is no good cause for that prejudice?—Certainly; but in this case I am not aware that it exists, nor do I believe it.

Veneris, 2° die Maii, 1823.

RICHARD WOGAN TALBOT, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John M'Mullen, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. John M'Mullen. (2 May.)

YOU have stated that there has been a gradual increase of committals to Newgate at different periods, for the last eighteen or twenty years, do you know the number of committals within the last year?—I have been informed that it was 2,135.

Do you know the number of committals in the year 1805?—In 1805, the number of committals was 628.

Have you any means of knowing what was the number of committals in the year 1780?—I have no document from which I can form an estimate.

Can you form a belief upon the subject?—I cannot.

Can you state what the expense of the support of prisoners in the year 1780 was?—I believe it amounted to 407*l.* 13*s.* 5*d.*

Do you think, that the increase in the number of committals from that year to the year 1822, is a fair criterion by which you ought to judge of the increase of the expense of supporting prisoners?—By no means; and I consider the distinction as one of great importance; if the construction and the arrangement of a gaol are regulated for the admission and the safe custody of 300 criminals, the difference which will arise when there are only 200 persons confined in it, will be necessarily limited to the mere value of the food consumed by 100 persons and the use of bedding; all the other charges would remain the same or very nearly so.

Under the particular circumstances of the city of Dublin, do you conceive the increase of committals a fair criterion, by which to judge of the necessary increase of expense?—I think the answer I have already given, is equally referrable to the gaols of the city of Dublin, as to any other gaol.

In point of fact, has the same gaol been sufficient, or has it been necessary to build increased accommodation for prisoners?—There has been another gaol built for the confinement of convicted criminals, in which I am informed that all criminals sentenced to terms of imprisonment beyond six months, are now confined.

That is the Richmond bridewell?—The Richmond or the City bridewell.

Has there not likewise been a place of confinement built in Smithfield for young criminals?—There has.

Then, in point of fact, there have been two extra prisons built for the accommodation of those prisoners within the time specified?—Yes.

Have they necessarily been built?—I should decidedly question the necessity of having increased the number to three; I think the preferable way would have been to enlarge the second, if necessary, in order to prevent the expense of a third establishment.

How many prisoners was Newgate originally calculated for?—I am informed 100.

How many have there usually been in it for the last few years?—I believe from 250 to 300.

Could it contain a greater number without imminent danger to the criminals themselves; is it not too crowded already?—I think it is too crowded already.

Have not the criminals in the city of Dublin amounted to from eight to 900?—I believe the prisoners, including debtors, amount to that number.

How then was it possible to have gone on in the city of Dublin without additional prisons?—I have admitted there has been a necessity for increase, but I think that the building of a third prison and forming a third establishment for the regulation and management of that prison, has been a measure in which the public economy has been by no means consulted.

What is the number which the Richmond penitentiary is calculated for?—I believe 300; but it is certainly much better calculated, in my judgment, for the accommodation of 300, than the gaol of Newgate is for 200.

Then both together, you think they are fairly calculated for 500 prisoners, one for 300, and the other for 200?—I think so.

Then, what are you to do with the remaining 300 prisoners that at present exist

Mr. John M'Mullen.

2 May.)

in the city of Dublin?—There are only about 100 more, exclusive of the sheriff's prison and the marshalsea; all convicted criminals, however ought, in my judgment, and from the best information I can obtain on the subject, to be sent to the penitentiary, which has been built, and is supported at the expense of government; and they should not be a charge upon the citizens of Dublin.

But until the law is altered, is not the city of Dublin obliged to provide for them, as the law at present stands; is it discretionary with the city of Dublin, whether they will have them or not?—I am not perfectly informed upon every part of the law of the case, but I apprehend that adequate efforts have never been made by the grand jury, to induce the government to take charge of those prisoners.

Are you aware, that those two extra prisons were built by the government of the country, without at all consulting or holding any communication with the city of Dublin on the subject?—I have been informed so, and I am bound to state the inference, that the government of the country could not compel the grand jury under those circumstances, to take those prisons off their hands.

Are you aware, that the grand jury under such an impression, refused to present for those prisons, and the judge in consequence refused to pass a single presentment till they first presented for the prison?—I have heard it so stated, and I consider the proceeding a most unconstitutional one; I can scarcely believe that it could have occurred in the way stated.

Do you conceive, however, that the grand jury are to blame in the part they took in it?—It is hard for me to answer that question, as I am uninformed of the degree of effort, which the grand jury made to resist the claim.

Then such being the case, you are of opinion of course, that the presentments for repaying government for building the bridewell, were not optional with the grand jury, but imperative, at least so the judge told them?—I have no doubt of the fact of the judge having told them so.

Are you aware, that the grand jury are bound to present certain sums, for the Wide-street improvements?—I believe so.

For improvements in the city of Dublin, south of the city, west of the castle?—I believe so.

Are you aware, that the improvements in Skinner's-row, were effected under the powers of that Act?—I believe so.

Are you aware, that that alone cost several thousand pounds?—I believe so.

Are you aware, that the grand jury positively refused to present for that sum, under the Wide-street board?—I have heard so.

Are you aware, of the Wide-street board applying to the court by counsel, on that subject?—I have heard the fact.

Have you heard, or do you believe, that the court on application, called out the grand jury and told them, that they were bound to present; and that he, by the law of the land, could not fix one single presentment for the city of Dublin, unless they did present for that?—I never heard that circumstance stated; the presentments to the commissioners of Wide-streets, however, form no part of the complaints now made against the grand jury cess; I conceive that to be another and a distinct subject.

Are you aware, that in the year 1780, there was no presentment for the fees upon prisoners, convicted or acquitted?—I believe so.

Are you aware, that by different Acts of Parliament, the prisoners are relieved from those payments, and the public are saddled with them?—I am aware, that Acts of Parliament have been passed for that purpose; but, if I am correctly informed, it is not imperative on the grand jury to present for the full sum, which the Act authorizes; that they are, in point of fact, left at liberty to do so, if they shall think proper; but that they are not bound to go to the extent, unless sufficient cause shall be shown; I believe, however, that in every case the presenting grand juries of the city of Dublin, have gone to the utmost maximum which the law allows in every case.

Have you read the Acts of Parliaments, by which the burthen of the fees is transferred to the grand jury?—I have seen several of those Acts, but not recently.

Are there a great number of those Acts?—There are.

Have you read them all?—I do not believe that I have read them all.

By the different Acts of Parliament, the salaries are limited to a certain amount, which they shall not exceed, in all cases but three?—I believe so.

Then it is only the amount of the salaries, that is discretional with the grand jury;

Mr. *John M'Mullen.* (2 May.)

are you of opinion, that the grand jury are bound to present for the salaries of officers, subject to their own discretion as to the amount?—I believe that the grand jury are authorized to appoint certain officers, if they think it necessary; and for those officers, with the exception of three, a maximum salary is fixed by law; I have reason to believe, that the grand juries in the city of Dublin, have uniformly appointed every officer which the law allowed them to do; and that they have in every case, carried the maximum of salary to its extreme point.

Are the grand jury of the city of Dublin singular in that practice?—I am not possessed of knowledge that will enable me to answer that question generally.

Do you believe that such has been the practice of every grand jury in Ireland?—I am not acquainted with the practice, but I believe not; I have heard of instances to the contrary.

Are the grand jury bound to support the prisoners and the convicts committed to gaol?—They are unquestionably bound to support prisoners committed for trial; but whether the law makes it imperative upon them to support and to clothe prisoners after conviction, I am not sufficiently informed; but I rather doubt the fact.

Are not all the contracts for the supplies that are necessary for the city of Dublin prisons, previously advertised in the papers?—I believe so; at the same time it has been stated to me, that the grand jury advertisements in the city of Dublin are limited to a certain newspaper; I am not aware of the fact from my own knowledge, nor have I recently examined into it.

Do you believe they are put in Saunders's News-letter?—I do.

Do you believe that Saunders's News-letter is the great advertising paper of the city of Dublin?—I believe so as to general, but not as to mercantile advertisements; and I am equally bound to state, that it has always been considered as the favourite paper of the corporation of the city of Dublin.

However, you think it is best calculated for giving publicity to advertisements?—I doubt that with respect to contracts; for I have reason to believe that it is not the newspaper which is most read by the mercantile or trading classes of society in Dublin.

In point of fact, have you ever heard that a contract has been given by the grand jury to a higher contractor when there was a lower before them?—I have never heard such fact stated; if it occurred, I conceive I could not possibly know it.

Are you aware that the proposals are all sent sealed to the secretary of the grand jury?—I believe so.

Are you aware that no proposal is received after the first day of term?—I should suppose that would depend upon the form of the advertisement.

Is it not the uniform mode, that no tender is received after the first day of term?—I was not aware that the time is limited by law.

Are you aware that, on the first day of term, all those proposals are laid on oath before the secretary of the grand jury?—I presume such is the practice.

And they are opened by the foreman of the grand jury the first day of term?—I do not know that fact.

Are you aware that the proposals are laid before the court on oath?—I believe such is the law, and ought to be the practice.

Are you aware that samples are sent in before the grand jury, with private marks, so that no person knows who the sample comes from?—I was not aware of that fact.

Can you suggest any improvement in the mode adopted by the grand jury in receiving contracts?—I believe that the system of contracts is, in the first instance, the fairest mode by which supplies could be obtained, and that if fairly administered by the grand jury; it is only in the subsequent operation of that system that any objection could arise to it.

By subsequent operation you mean a deficiency in the quality of the supplies, or difficulties thrown in the way of the contractors?—I do.

Are you aware what steps are taken by the grand jury to secure a supply equal to the pattern?—I believe it is the peculiar province of the inspector of prisons to ascertain that the supply is equal to the pattern.

Besides that, do the grand jury themselves take any steps to secure the performance of the inspector's duty in that respect?—While they are assembled during term, I have always understood that they occasionally visit the prisons.

Have you heard, or are you aware, that, before they dissolve, they appoint a committee

Mr.
John M'Mullen.

(2 May.)

a committee of twelve persons to examine the gaol before their next meeting?—I have heard that such is the present practice.

Then any difficulties thrown in the way of the practice must arise either with the inspector, or with that committee?—I do not think that follows.

What other bodies can throw any difficulties in the way of contractors furnishing the supplies?—Difficulties of that description, I should suppose, must originate from inferior officers, and generally from their representations.

What inferior officers can do it?—I should think that all the inferior officers of the gaols have access, both to the inspector and to the committee of the grand jury, and have an opportunity of making to them such representations as they think proper; and I further am induced to think, that many of the articles furnished by the contractors, must necessarily be of that description of which the principal members of the committee of the grand jury, as well as the inspector himself, may be but imperfect judges.

The committee are appointed by ballot?—I do not know that fact.

Are you aware of the sums presented in the year 1822 for food, clothing, bedding, coals, candles, oil, soap, and employment for all the prisoners in the city of Dublin?—I do not know the exact amount.

Would you conceive 5¼ *d.* a head per day for all the expenses of a prisoner, including food, clothing, employment, medicine, incidents, and every expense, an exorbitant allowance or too large?—There is a great difficulty in answering the question; employment is brought in as a part of the expense, whereas it should be a saving; according to the scale of expense in our prisons, I should think that charge unnecessarily high.

For all things included, you think 5¼ *d.* exorbitant?—The amount does not appear exorbitant, at the same time the Committee must be well aware, that, in many other prisons, the expenditure is much smaller.

Name the prison in the empire that you know of, where the expense is less than 5¼ *d.* per day for every expense of a prisoner?—The Glasgow and Preston houses of correction, and the Maidstone gaol, which I have already mentioned.

What is the allowance in the Preston house of correction?—The whole expense was only 100*l.* in one year, or thereabouts.

Do you think 5¼*d.* a day too much to expend upon the food and clothing, and every incident?—I cannot think it too much to be actually expended in the food and clothing of any individual, whether prisoner or otherwise; but I am clearly of opinion that the public ought not to pay 5¼ *d.* a day for the support of prisoners who can be employed; they ought to earn a large proportion of the expense incurred in supporting them.

If then the expense of the prisoners in the city of Dublin appear to be under 5¼ *d.* a day, you cannot think that they are extravagantly supplied?—Certainly not extravagantly.

Are you aware of any traverse having been taken to any particular presentment by the grand jury?—I am aware of a traverse having been made in the course of last term by the parish of St. Mary, under circumstances which I consider extremely hard, and which show the severe and oppressive operation of the present grand jury system; in that term the treasurer claimed from that parish, arrears of 1,250*l.* which were fiated by the court; the warrant which apprized the churchwardens of that fiat, was not delivered to them until the period allowed by law for traversing had expired; a traverse was nevertheless attempted on the part of the parish, but the court was obliged to confirm its previous fiat, admitting the great hardship of the case, but ruled by the letter of the law; the sum disputed by the parish amounted, as I am informed, to between five and six hundred pounds, and which I firmly believe, is not due to the treasurer; the whole amount claimed by the treasurer was 1,251*l.* 5*s.*; this sum is composed of various arrears alleged to have accrued during a period of more than fourteen years; it was disputed by the parish in the year 1820, and at that period two accounts were furnished to the churchwardens in support of it, one of which alleged that 1,289*l.* 10*s.* 4½*d.* was due, and the second, that the true balance was no more than 859*l.* 15*s.* 4½*d.*; the latter of these accounts was calculated and stated by Mr. Jameson, an eminent public accountant. It further appears, that returns of the insolvent arrears of the parish for Easter term 1817, Michaelmas 1818 and 1819, and Easter 1820, were made on oath by the collectors, from which it can be shown, that errors exist even in the account stated by Mr. Jameson, and that credits should have been given to the parish which are omitted. In the accounts stated by the treasurer, it is

Mr.
John McMullen.

(2 May.)

represented that in Easter term 1817, the insolvencies amounted to the sum of 536*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.* whereas the true amount returned by the collector, was only 282*l.* 9*s.* making a credit fairly due to the parish, of 252*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* In the applotment for Michaelmas 1818, there is an error of a similar kind to the prejudice of the parish of 99*l.* 19*s.* 10*d.* In the applotment for Easter 1820, and in the subsequent terms, similar errors and differences appear to exist, which cannot now be ascertained, as the parish have not been furnished with the proper returns, but from all which it is fairly to be presumed, that the balance claimed by the treasurer of the grand jury, would be still further greatly reduced, if the account were fully and fairly stated and settled. The affidavit in which this is detailed, proceeds to state, that at a full vestry the churchwardens were instructed to traverse this presentment for the arrears of 1,251 *l.* 5*s.* and that this would have been done within the period limited by law, had the parishioners been aware of the amount of the presentment; the warrant, however, was not delivered till the time for traversing had expired, and the court, though unwillingly, was obliged, as I have already stated, to refuse the application and to confirm the presentment. The overcharge, as far as I can learn, is in this case not less than from 500*l.* to 600*l.*

Then in point of fact, the court determined that the law was against you?—Yes.

Then the fault is in the law, and not in the grand jury?—Certainly, there is a fault in the law, but I blame the officer of the grand jury for not having served the warrant in time, this was owing to the neglect either of the grand jury, or their officer.

Were not the sums contained in those arrears fiated six months before, by the court?—I am not aware of the fact, and as far as I am informed, it is not possible that it could be the case.

The arrears must have been fiated by the preceding judge, at the instance of the grand jury?—It is not to be considered merely in the light of a presentment, but in the light of a disputed account.

Was that a disputed account as between the treasurer and the parish?—Yes.

The grand jury had nothing to say to that account?—The individual members of the grand jury had, perhaps, nothing to say to it, but I think the detail of the circumstances must clearly show that the accounts of the grand jury, and of the treasurer, are kept in a manner that is highly objectionable, and that very great difficulty exists in obtaining redress.

Are you aware of any transaction that took place between Alderman Nugent and a Mr. Dalton, who was in his employ, and who was a contractor?—Mr. Dalton has been frequently the contractor for the clothing and bedding furnished to the gaol of Newgate; during the time that he undertook those contracts, he was, as I am informed, the clerk or shopman of Alderman Nugent.

Did you not say, that the grand juries of Dublin have not much of the confidence of the parishes or of the city?—That is my opinion.

Is that opinion founded on thinking that they misuse their powers of presentment?—It is.

You said that among other misuses of that power, the salaries of officers and the payment of expenses of prisons was one abuse and complaint?—Yes.

Is that opinion founded upon any examination of the expense of the prisons in the city of London?—It is partly so founded; at the same time I do not think that the prisons of the city of London ought to be made a standard by which the expenditure of the prisons of Dublin should be measured, inasmuch as the funds which are applied in support of the prisons of London, are, in point of fact, almost private property; the prisons of the city of London are supported at the expense of the corporation, and not by any tax or assessment levied upon the householders.

In the instance of surgeon to the city of London, what is the expense of the surgeon, including medicine?—The whole medical expense of the gaol of Newgate, in London, is only 500 *l.* a year.

Does that include all medicine and medical expense, and does it include all expense of nursing, &c. &c.; is it for all matters connected with medicinal purposes?—So I am informed.

Are you informed of the number contained in each of those gaols?—The number at present contained in Newgate, in London, is about 310.

What may be the comparative expense of the prisons in Dublin, as compared with

Mr
John M'Mullen.
(2 May.)

with that of the number of prisoners confined, and what is the cost in each for medical expenses?—I have already stated to the Committee, that the medical expenses of the gaols in Dublin were last year above 1,500 *l.*

Upon comparison with the number that are at present in the prisons of Dublin, and that get medicinal aid at that expense, what proportion do they bear to the number supported in the gaol of Newgate, in London; what are the number of prisoners in Dublin?—I believe the persons committed for trial and the convicted criminals under rule of transportation and of imprisonment may at present be from 650 to 700.

Are you sure now that you are right in saying that the trouble of the surgeon is confined in London strictly to the prison of Newgate; does he get that 500 *l.* for the prison of Newgate, or are his labours extended farther than that?—I have been informed that such is the fact; I believe that the medical officer who attends the gaol of Newgate and who acts both as physician and surgeon, receives 500 *l.* a year, out of which he has to pay an assistant, and to provide all medicines and necessaries for the prisoners.

Is he obliged to find nurses and those expenses?—I understood that he was to find medicines; I am not as yet informed as to the payment of nurses.

Are you aware that in the medical expense of 1,500 *l.* which you say the prisons of Dublin cost, that there is there included the salary of the surgeon?—It is part of the 1,500 *l.*

How much is the salary of the surgeon?—Two hundred guineas.

Then is the remainder all for medicines?—The physician to the gaols receives out of it a salary of 400 *l.* a year.

Have you been employed since you came to this town in examining the expense of the London prisons?—I have devoted some time to that purpose.

Have you made any comparisons between the support and expenses of the Dublin prisons and those of London?—In the case of the medical expense, and the expense of clothing; and I find further in my inquiries, that the expense of clothing transports is defrayed entirely at the charge of government, and that no delay occurs in removing them; in the city of Dublin, it has been hitherto assessed by the grand jury and paid by the householders.

Have you made any other comparisons between the relative expenses of the London and Dublin prisons, considering number and diversity of circumstances, &c.?—I have not hitherto fully done so; but I intend to do it previous to my next examination before the Committee.

But you are sure there is both a physician and a surgeon in the Dublin prisons?—There is; the apothecary also has *a salary* of 20 *l.* a year, exclusive of his bill for medicines.

Are not the gentlemen who compose the grand jury of Dublin generally people in trade, merchants, &c.?—They are uniformly composed of the aldermen and sheriff's-peers of the city, the principal part of whom are not engaged in trade; many of them are persons who have retired from it; at present there are but a few of them who are actively engaged in trading or commercial pursuits; a considerable proportion of them are always police magistrates.

Do you think that the proceedings of the grand jury would be benefited, if men of the first property were put upon that grand jury; do you think it would improve their proceedings?—I think it would decidedly have that effect.

Are you aware that the election to grand juries is bounded entirely by the corporation?—It has been exclusively so, for many years back.

Did you hear of any instance in which that usage was departed from?—I am not aware of any such instance.

Recollect yourself?—The fact may be, that some individual unconnected with the corporation has been on a grand jury; but I am not aware of the circumstance.

You have stated that advertisements are published for proposals for contracts for the gaols?—Yes.

Are the contracts subsequently advertised as given?—They are not.

Nor the individuals who get those contracts?—No.

Would it be any check or benefit to the public, if the particulars of the contracts, and the names of the contractors, were given to the public subsequently to their getting the contract?—I think it would afford decided advantage.

You

Mr.
John M'Mullen.

(2 May.)

You have no means of knowing what proposals are sent into the grand jury?—I have not.

Are you aware of any practicable means by which that evil could be obviated?—I am clearly of opinion, that great advantage would result to the public, if the names of the contractors, and the prices at which the articles are furnished, were regularly published; but I conceive that the only efficient and practicable remedy must be found in a better system in obtaining a public investigation of the accounts of the grand jury, and of the disbursements for the account of the gaols. As the case stands at present, there is no control whatever beyond the grand juries or their officers; all other public boards go before the commissioners of imprest accounts.

You have stated the expense of the medical department; what is the state of the prisons in that department?—When I visited the gaol of Newgate in Dublin, on the 23d of April, there were, in the male medical hospital, only three patients; one of those was confined to bed, the other two were apparently convalescent. In the male surgical hospital there were four patients, making seven in all. In the female hospital there were no patients; the superintendent, however, stated to me that a few of the prisoners, both male and female, were furnished occasionally with some trifling medicines of the cheapest description.

Have you seen any of the apothecary's bills?—I have not.

Did you ask for them?—I know that efforts have been made to obtain copies of the apothecary's bills for medicines furnished to Newgate in Dublin; but the efforts were not successful.

How did it fail?—They would not furnish the statement.

Were not the entire bills laid before the court of King's bench?—I am not aware of the fact.

Is there any individual acquaintance of your's who ever proposed for contracts?—Frequently.

Can you name any one individual?—I am aware of proposals for contracts having been made, for the supply of linen for the use of the gaols, by one respectable gentleman at the Linen-hall, who I am of opinion could have furnished that article on better terms than any of the usual contractors; but he did not obtain the contract.

Did he offer less than the person who did obtain it?—That I cannot know.

Has there ever been any suspicion of offers being rejected to supply on lower terms?—I can have no personal knowledge of any fact of the kind, but it certainly is the impression upon the minds of many persons in Dublin, that fair play is not given.

Can you mention any individual by name?—Not of my own knowledge; but cases have been stated to me, upon authority which I cannot doubt, and which, to my mind, are quite decisive of the question.

You have said, that an individual proposed for a contract, and did not get it; do you know what was the impression upon his mind with respect to that?—The impression which I have frequently heard him state, was, that he should have had it, that, from peculiar circumstances, it was quite impossible; but that his offer must have been lower than that of the individual who got the contract.

Does the state of the law afford facility for traversing?—I think not; the tax is originally assessed in secret; the grand-jury room is altogether so; and when (as has been elsewhere ably and truly stated by an eminent lawyer) the presentments are about to be fiated, they are read by an officer, in a sort of *tête a tête* with the judge, with his back to the bystanders, and in a voice and manner very imperfectly audible to the most attentive listener. The Act also of the 33d of George 3. instead of affording facilities to traverse, throws the utmost possible obstacles in the way; it directs, in very special terms, that, whether the traverse be made in open court, or before one of the judges within eight days after term, the traverser shall first give sufficient security to pay double costs, in case the jury to try such traverse shall confirm the presentment.

Is there any difference in the manner of getting a presentment in the city and in the county?—I am not aware of any distinction; but I would avail myself of the opportunity to state my decided conviction, from the best attention which I can give the subject, that however necessary the present grand jury system may be in the counties of Ireland, that necessity can by no means be supposed to exist with respect to the city of Dublin, where the money necessary for the public service could be raised with equal convenience by other modes, in which the public voice could have a more perfect and efficacious control over its disbursement.

What other tribunal would you invest it in?—I would suggest the election of commissioners

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(2 May.)

commissioners by the householders of Dublin, in the same manner as the local taxation of some other towns in Ireland is already managed.

Which, for instance?—Belfast.

Are you aware of any improprieties that at present take place in the collection of parish cess by the churchwardens in the city of Dublin?—I am not aware of it.

Have you heard within the last two years of any defaulting churchwardens in the city of Dublin?—I have not; it may have been the case, but I am ignorant of it.

Have you looked over the names of the persons to whom presentments are made?—Yes.

Amongst them there is Mr. Montgomery; is he any immediate connexion of any of the gentlemen who are in the habit of serving upon those grand juries?—I believe he is son-in-law to Alderman Exshaw.

The public accountant is Mr. Daniel Hutton; are you aware whether he has any immediate connexion with any of the gentlemen belonging to the corporation?—He is brother to the late Alderman Hutton.

Mr. Frederick Bourne, the keeper of Newgate; has he any immediate connexion with any gentlemen accustomed to serve on grand juries?—I believe he is brother-in-law to Alderman Archer, or in some other way very closely connected with him by marriage.

Mr. Purdon appears to be governor of bridewell; is he any immediate connexion of any gentleman accustomed to serve on the grand juries?—He is Alderman Archer's son-in-law.

Martis, 6° die Maii, 1823.

SIR ROBERT SHAW, BARONET,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John M^c Mullen, again called in; and Examined.

(6 May.)

CAN you inform the Committee what sum was expended on the present city bridewell?—About 56,000 *l.*

How much of that was expended under the orders of government previous to the management of the gaol being handed over to the grand jury?—I believe about 28,700 *l.*; there was a further presentment of 13,980 *l.* to certain members of the grand jury as commissioners for completing the building; another presentment also to members of the grand jury of 5,000 *l.* for enclosing gardens, for procuring a clock for the prison, and for various other purposes.

The three latter sums were presentments?—Yes; and there have been frequent and large presentments since, for alterations and other works, amounting altogether to about 56,000 *l.*

Do you know how they were executed or contracted for?—One item has been stated to me; the Alderman Warner was one of the commissioners, he furnished a clock, for which, I am informed, his brother commissioners paid him so large a sum as 370 *l.*

How do you know, or in what way are you informed, that Mr. Warner received that sum?—I do not, of my own knowledge, know the fact; but I am convinced that it will appear in the accounts of the commissioners.

Have you seen that item in the accounts?—No, I have not seen the accounts.

Who are the commissioners?—The commissioners were the leading members of the grand jury.

Do you know anything of the penitentiary at Grange Gorman Lane?—I do.

What was the expense of it?—The expense incurred in building the penitentiary at Grange Gorman, was about 70,000 *l.*

How many will it hold?—It is calculated to contain 600 convicts.

How many will the city bridewell hold?—Three hundred; but the Grange Gorman penitentiary is, in every respect, a vastly superior prison.

Is it better built?—It is built on the newest and most approved principle and plan.

Have you visited any of the London gaols since you were last examined before the Committee?—I have.

Can you give the Committee any information as to any part of their expenses?—

I inquired

Mr. John M^cMullen.

(6 May.)

I inquired particularly into the medical expenses of those gaols; I found that the medical attendant at Newgate, in consideration of his salary of 500*l.* a year, attends the prisons of Newgate, Giltspur-street, and the Borough compter, and finds all descriptions of medicines wanted in those three gaols, and also pays an assistant.

Are there any hospital keepers or nurses employed on salaries in those prisons?—None; some of the best conducted of the convicts are permitted to perform those duties, for which they receive a small addition to their daily rations, and if very deserving, their exertions are in some cases, allowed to recommend them for a mitigation of punishment; I visited also, the gaol for the county of Surrey, in Horsemonger-lane, the surgeon, who is the only medical attendant, has a salary of 100*l.* out of which he finds all medicines; I do not, however, conceive that the expenses of any establishment in Ireland should be measured by corresponding charges for a similar one in England; we have many at home, which are regulated upon the most economical, and at the same time, the most efficient principles; the county of Dublin infirmary or Meath hospital, is one instance amongst many, and I will beg leave to present a statement of the expense incurred at that institution, for medicines and necessaries during the last four years, with an account of the number of internal and external patients.

[*It was delivered in, and read as follows:*]

Meath Hospital and County of Dublin Infimary Medical Return:

	PATIENTS.
1819:	
Admitted	503
Discharged and cured	477
Died	20
1820:	
Admitted	499
Discharged cured	474
Died	28
1821:	
Admitted	548
Discharged cured	507
Died	35
1822:	
Admitted	529
Discharged cured	517
Died	27

Paid for Medicines and Necessaries:

	£.	s.	d.
1819	148	8	10½
1820	173	10	2
1821	197	1	–
1822	192	–	6½

The number of external patients cannot be correctly ascertained, but it is presumed they may be fairly averaged at about 250 per day. An official return by Mr. Cussack Rooney, surgeon to the establishment.

Could you now inform the Committee, how any reduction could be made in those expenses in the Dublin gaols?—I have taken a good deal of pains to obtain the most accurate information on that subject, and I am perfectly certain, that many gentlemen possessing the most ample and honourable testimonials from the college of surgeons, and in every possible respect qualified, would be found to undertake the attendance upon the sick in all the gaols, for a salary of 150*l.* a year; and I am equally certain, that all the necessary medicines could be furnished for 100*l.* a year; the saving under this head alone, would consequently exceed 1,000*l.* per annum; I should not make the statement with respect to the cost of medicines so confidently, had I not inquired of the most respectable surgeon to the London gaols; he was so obliging, as to refer to his accounts, by which he most clearly and satisfactorily showed me, that the cost of medicines for the three gaols under his

Mr. John M'Mullen.

(6 May.)

superintendence, is under 100 *l.* a year; the number of patients seldom averages less than forty; a larger proportion than will be found at any one time in the whole of the Dublin gaols.

Do you mean that the offices of physician and surgeon should be united?—I conceive there should be only a fully qualified surgeon amongst the faculty of Dublin; a consulting physician who would act gratuitously, would be readily found in England; as far as I have been able to ascertain, the consulting physicians, when such an officer is attached, to the gaol, never receives a salary; that the present salary of the surgeon is unnecessarily large, is evident from the fact, that the gentleman who now fills the office, paid 500 *l.* for it, with a clause, that his predecessor should, during his life, have half the amount of any future increase which might be made in the salary, by the grand jury.

Do you know that?—I know that by the admission of one of the grand jury.

It was stated to you by one of the grand jury?—It was stated to me by various persons, and I inquired of the truth of this fact from a member of the grand jury, who admitted that it was true.

Do you see at page 104 of the printed presentments, a presentment to Allen and Green?—I do.

For what purpose?—For making a return to Parliament of the number of committals to Newgate in 1819.

What is the amount?—The charge likewise appears in the preceding year; the amount in each instance is thirty guineas.

Who are Allen and Green?—Town clerks; I inquired in Newgate in London, and found that such returns were made by the keeper without any compensation.

You mentioned that the expense of blankets was considerable in the Dublin gaols; what was the amount?—In the printed accounts the charge for blankets is almost always mixed up with other articles, so that it is impossible to ascertain either the quantity or the price; in 1816, there were 300 pairs supplied, and the quantity is uniformly large; in Michaelmas term, in the year 1819, there is a presentment to Mr. Studdart, 213 *l.* 7 *s.*; a second presentment to the same gentleman of 133 *l.* 12 *s.*; and in the same term, a third presentment for blankets and other necessaries, 659 *l.* 14 *s.* 8 *d.*, making a total of 1,006 *l.* 13 *s.* 8 *d.* but how much of the last sum was expended upon articles other than blankets I have no means of ascertaining.

Within what period of time?—Within one term and included in one presentment: in 1821 and 1822, the consumption would appear to be about 650 pairs, besides rugs, &c. &c.

Are blankets used at Newgate in London?—No.

What substitute do they use?—The prisoners are allowed only coloured rugs, and they sleep upon hemp mats made by the convicts in the other prisons.

Who is generally the contractor for supplying blankets in Dublin?—Mr. Studdart a sheriffs peer; in page 109, there is a presentment to him for blankets 145 *l.* 13 *s.* 6 *d.* Mr. Studdart served upon the grand jury, who presented this sum to himself; his name appears on the list; and it would consequently appear, either that the blankets were not furnished by contract and that the usual system was abandoned in this instance, or that if they were furnished by contract, the law was violated, which forbids a grand juror from being a contractor, or from directly or indirectly receiving any profit from a contract, under a very heavy penalty.

What was the date of that?—The date is Michaelmas 1820.

Does it appear that Mr. Studdart was upon the grand jury which adopted the contract for blankets provided by him?—It does not appear, whether the contract was entered into at that or the preceding term.

Have you the means of ascertaining the fact?—I have not; nor do I conceive it material, as there is a further presentment to Mr. Studdart in the very next term, Easter 1821, for blankets 111 *l.* 8 *s.* 9 *d.*; he must have been a consenting party in his character of a grand juror to one or the other of these contracts, if not to both.

Do any other Aldermen usually serve upon grand juries, that supply blankets? —In Easter term in 1813, there is a presentment to Alderman Nugent for this purpose.

Can you undertake to say, whether Mr. Nugent was upon the grand jury at that period?—I have not, at present, the means of ascertaining it.

Are there any others of the supplies of the gaols that appear to you unnecessarily large?—In the two gaols of Newgate and the city bridewell, the supply of coals from 1816 to 1820, appears to cost upon an average nearly 700 *l.* a year; the

quantity

Mr.
John M‘Mullen.

(6 May.)

quantity consumed appears to be about 450 or from that to 500 tons; in 1821 the quantity would appear to be about 850 tons, amounting to 1,033*l.* 1*s.* 1*d.*

Do you know what was the whole expense of white-washing the prisons in any one year?—In 1815, it cost 182*l.*

Does that include all the gaols?—I believe all the gaols; there are two items in the presentments for Michaelmas term 1815, the first is 136*l.* 10*s*; and the second 45*l.* 10*s.* making in all 182*l.*; in 1816, it cost 109*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; and in 1817, 107*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.*

Who is the contractor?—The presentments for 1815, are to Mr. Charles Thorp.

Are they all to him?—I do not think they are; in 1816 there is one presentment to him for 80 *l.* and another to William M‘Cornick for 29 *l.* 11 *s.* 6*d.* the rest are to him.

Was Mr. Thorp upon the grand jury at that period?—I believe not.

How do you think he got the contract?—I am not aware how he got the contract, but I observe the name of his uncle, Alderman Charles Thorp, upon the list of the grand jury for Michaelmas 1815.

Are you sure that he got any contract at all for white washing?—I do not know that it was done by contract, but he obtained a presentment for it as I have stated.

Does the expense of cleansing the gaol of Newgate appear in any of the presentments?—It uniformly appears on the presentments, but it is almost always mixed up with other charges, and I cannot show the exact sum to the Committee; at Michaelmas 1814 it is stated separately, and amounted to 74*l.* 19*s.* 1 *d.*

Was that in one year?—In one term, in one half year.

Is there any charge for washing at any of the hospitals of the prisons which could be done in any other way?—Uniformly a charge for washing; I think it amounts to from 25 *l.* to 30 *l.* a year; it ought to be done by the convicts in the bridewell.

Can you give any information to the Committee as to any of the presentments for work done at the gaols?—I have looked attentively into the printed presentments with reference to this subject, and I find that a large proportion of the works done at the gaols, if not actually contracted for by members of the grand jury, are uniformly executed by them, and that very large sums have always passed through their hands in this way; in Easter term 1816 there is a presentment to Aldermen Darley, Read, Thorp and others, to make sundry repairs and alterations in Newgate, 945*l.* 3*s.*; Alderman Thorp was a builder, Alderman Darley a stone cutter, and Alderman Read a plumber; in the next term, at page 71, there is another presentment to the same individuals, and for the same purposes, amounting to 794*l.* 9*s.* 6 *d.* it states the particulars of the work to be done, the largest proportion of it is stone cutters and plasterers work; in Easter term 1820, there is a presentment to Alderman Darley and Matthew O'Brien, for stone cutters work at Richmond bridewell; Alderman Darley served upon the grand jury, who made the presentments, and Matthew O'Brien, as I am informed, is his foreman at his manufactory; at the same term 1820, there is a presentment to Alderman Darley and H. C. Sirr for carpenters work; a third to Alderman Darley and Francis Johnstone for ironmongery, and a fourth to Matthew O'Brien, Alderman Darley's foreman, for stone cutters work, amounting altogether to 603*l.* 13 *s.*

You have stated, that large sums are presented to the inspector of gaols for necessaries, clothing, bedding, and so forth; can you give any instance of any particular sum?—I can; at Easter term 1815, there are two presentments for him to provide blankets, rugs, shirts, ticks, and other necessaries, amounting to 759 *l.* 11*s.*; at the succeeding term, another presentment for the like purposes; at Easter term 1816, another to provide bedding and clothes, 182 *l.* 0 *s.* 4 *d.*; at Michaelmas 1817, another, expressly *to purchase* shirts, rugs, ticks, &c. which are usually supplied by contract; at Michaelmas term 1818, another to provide necessaries, 650*l.*; at Michaelmas 1819, another to provide clothes and necessaries, 245*l.*; and at Easter term 1820, to provide necessaries for Newgate, 684*l.* 11 *s.* 11 *d.* There are similar presentments to the dissenting chaplain for providing similar necessaries, also to a very large amount, in some instances as much as 800 *l.* or 900 *l.* in one term. In Michaelmas sessions 1815, there is one presentment of 700 *l.*

Are you aware of the reason why those large sums are presented to the inspector and dissenting minister for supplying necessaries and other articles for the prisons?—I am not aware of any particular reason.

Are you aware, that it is because the offers for the contracts, that have been published in the papers, have not been taken?—I am not aware of the circumstance.

If that were the case, would not that account for the large sums at the disposal of

Mr. John M'Mullen. (6 May.)

of the inspector and other officers?—It would account for large sums being disposed of by some of the officers of prisons.

Does not the legislature contemplate such a contingency?—I suppose it may; but I have never understood that the inspector is the person pointed out in that case.

Does not the inspector account most rigidly to the grand jury for the expenditure of every shilling?—I have no reason to doubt that he accounts to the grand jury; but as to the severity of the scrutiny, I have great doubts.

Is his salary presented by the grand jury until he has accounted for every sixpence of public money that passes through his hands?—I am not aware of the practice.

Then the Committee are to understand from you, that you are not acquainted with the manner in which the business is done by the grand jury of the city of Dublin?—I am not much acquainted with the precise practice; I never served upon the grand jury.

Did you ever serve upon the grand jury of the county?—Never.

Then you are not aware of the accuracy and attention with which grand jurors, upon their oaths, generally inquire into the expenditure of public money by the servants under their control?—I am not aware of it; I have often heard the want of such accuracy and attention complained of.

Do you know any thing of any contract for bread?—The present contractor for bread, is a person of the name of Rickard; the supply was for many years in the hands of Mr. Isaac Manders, son (as I am informed) to Alderman Manders, who is one of those who most frequently served upon the grand juries; in Michaelmas term 1817, both the names of Alderman Manders and Richard Manders, junior, appear on the list of the grand jury; and amongst the sums presented by them, I find 2,098 *l.* 16 *s.* 8 *d.* to Isaac Manders for bread; at Michaelmas term 1818, the name of Richard Manders, junior, appears on the grand jury, and the presentment for bread to Isaac Manders, amounts to 1,646 *l.* 14 *s.* 1 *d.*

Do you know how Mr. Rickard came to get the contract for the bread for the gaols?—I do not precisely know; I believe the change arose out of some observations by the court of King's Bench, upon the uniform regularity with which some individual of Alderman Manders' family had the contract for a great number of years previously.

Have not you heard, that it was because Mr. Rickard proposed at a lower rate?—I do not know any thing about the proposals.

Was it not because a lower contract was offered than Mr. Manders's?—I am not aware of the price at which the bread was supplied in that year, but the change was made, as I was informed, at the suggestion of the court of King's Bench; I was not present, but I have heard it very frequently stated, and I believe it.

Was it not in consequence of an advertisement for contracts, that Mr. Rickard got it?—I suppose that may have been one cause of it.

Are you aware that the contracts for the prisons are not always taken that are advertised, that there are sometimes no proposals sent in?—I am not accurately informed upon the subject, but I should not be at all surprised at it.

You have stated, that a man of the name of Manders supplied the prisoners with bread for a number of years, whilst Alderman Manders's name appeared as grand juror, and you stated also, that he was succeeded by a man named Rickard?—His immediate successor was, I believe, a Mr. Booth, and I believe the present contractor is Mr. Rickard.

Have you, from your examination of those accounts, discovered whether the contract offered by Manders, was at a higher rate than that offered by Rickard?—I have had no opportunity of making such examination.

Then the Committee are to understand, that you have confined your observations to those terms in which the name of Manders appears as the contractor?—I have stated already, that in other terms the contract was taken by a baker, Mr. Booth, and in another, by a Mr. Rickard; and I believe those three names comprise a great number of years.

Then could not you, as you seem very accurate in your other calculations, easily have ascertained whether the contract by Manders was not offered to the public upon as reasonable terms as that by his successor?—The price of bread, in a great number of years, must of course have very much fluctuated; and I suppose the price of one year would afford no criterion to judge of the price of another.

Your objection is directed rather against the system, than against any particular individual?—It is.

Mr. John M'Mullen. (6 May.)

Are you aware, that the judge may call for all contracts into court which are tendered to the grand jury, for the supply of any article?—I have no doubt of the fact, but I do not recollect that I ever heard any instance of its occurrence.

You stated, that you supposed or heard, that the contract was taken from Manders, in consequence of an observation made by the judge of the court, that he was too constantly the contractor?—I have heard the circumstance stated repeatedly.

Are you aware, that the judge might have satisfied his own mind, that Manders was the lowest contractor, by calling for the different contracts into court, and examining them himself?—I have no doubt of it.

Are you aware, that the judge has no power to deprive a person of a contract, if it appears upon the documents admitted to him, that he makes the lowest offer?—I believe such is the law.

Then does it not appear to you, that the observation of the judge as to Manders being too constantly the contractor, would have been worse than absurd, if it appeared that he offered the articles at the lowest price to the public?—If it so appeared; but at the same time I have not the smallest doubt that the observation was made, I have heard the fact so repeatedly stated, and from so many different quarters, that I cannot doubt it.

But you think it was a suspicious circumstance, the contract having so frequently gone in one channel, and that being a connexion of a grand juror?—That I am persuaded was the opinion of the public in general on that subject; and it was, I believe, also the substance of the observations of the court.

It appears that contracts were advertised for in the paper, for the supply of the public establishments; and that in some cases, those contracts were not taken, and that therefore, the inspectors furnished the articles; do you know that any contracts advertised, were not proposed for?—I believe I have stated already, that I have no knowledge of the facts; but I am perfectly certain, that if any second advertisement had appeared, stating that no proposals had been made, and calling upon the public to come forward, there would have been abundance of offers for such contracts; they would then have been evidently open to fair competition.

Do you know from your knowledge of the dealings in the city of Dublin and any other capital town, that there are not a great many persons looking to means of making profit by sales of different commodities?—I certainly never knew competition in every line of trade, so active and so busy as it is, and has been for some time in Dublin; the difficulty of making money, or even earning a livelihood is felt by all the middle and trading classes of society.

Under those circumstances, how can you account for there being no proposals for those contracts?—I can account for it in no other way than that the impression upon the public mind, as far as I have any possible opportunity knowing it, is decidedly that the grand jury contracts in Dublin, are not so open to public competition as they ought to be; the impression may be erroneous, but I certainly feel that it does exist.

Do you think, or have you heard, that if any person who was not in the usual habit of taking the contracts, were to bid against any favorites of the grand jury, do you think that person would be dealt with in the same way as those persons in the usual habit of getting those contracts; would the gaoler receive it in the same way from a stranger as from a favourite of the corporation?—I can only state the impression on my own mind, and that is most decidedly, that a stranger would not be dealt with on the same terms; and I beg further to explain, there are many articles and necessaries, such as sheet, shirts and ticks, which it is quite in the line of my own business to supply, and for which I could take a contract without the slightest inconvenience to myself, if I had been aware that such contracts are frequently not taken, or that I could have taken them with any rational expectation of profiting, even in a small degree by them; in such a case I should possibly have proposed for them, at all events I know many, who I am sure would have done so.

Why should you think you would not profit by them?—Because the decided impression on my mind was, that I had no chance of obtaining those contracts, under such circumstances as would have enabled me to profit by them, while the usual contractors were so closely connected with the grand jury.

Have you any other reason; did you conceive you would in the supply of that contract, be more hardly dealt with, than a friend of the corporation?—I did suppose, that in the actual supply of those articles, I should not be dealt with on the same terms as those who are considered to be the favourites of the grand jury.

Mr. *John M'Mullen.*

(6 May.)

Are the people who supply those articles, generally speaking, the connections of the grand jury, and the near connections of the grand jury?—They are almost uniformly so.

Are the people who receive the necessaries supplied by contract, that is, the gaolers, &c. the connections of the grand jury?—The gaolers of the Dublin gaols are all the connections of the grand jury.

Are they not the people that must approve or disapprove of the articles sent in under the contracts?—I believe the immediate approval or disapproval of the articles rests with the inspector.

Then in consequence of the failure of the contracts, you were understood to say, that money was voted to the inspector to supply those articles himself?—I believe so, but I have no positive knowledge of the fact.

You said, that the dissenting minister got about six or seven hundred pounds for his supply?—Large sums have been frequently voted to him in the presentments for furnishing clothing and necessaries for the gaols.

There was no contract for them?—I should suppose not.

Do you know why there was no contract; were they advertised for contract?—I should suppose so.

Are not the contracts regularly advertised for every grand jury?—I have already stated that I believe they are.

You have stated that the gaolers of almost all the gaols in Dublin are generally connections of the grand jury; who is Mr. Frederick Bourne a connection of?—He is closely connected, by marriage, with Alderman Archer.

Mr. Marston, who is he a connection of?—I am not aware of his connection with any member of the grand jury; Mr. Purden, the governor of bridewell, is son-in-law to Alderman Archer.

Mr. Wilson, the deputy governor, how is he connected with any member of the corporation?—I do not know; Sheriff's Peer Wood is the governor of the sheriff's prison.

Do you know what year Mr. Bourne was appointed gaoler at Newgate?—I think about seven years ago.

Can you undertake to say that he was appointed gaoler at the time Alderman Archer sat as a grand juror?—He is elected by the corporation where Mr. Archer's influence is very powerful.

Then there is not any necessary connection between the appointment of a gaoler elected by the corporation, and the relationship of that gaoler to a grand juror?—Only in so far as the leading members of the corporation always form the grand juries; the Alderman in question serves very constantly.

You have paid a great deal of attention to the grand jury cess in general?—I have paid a good deal of attention to it, at the same time I consider the system so large and so complicated that it is almost impossible for any individual, who has other private pursuits to attend to, to make himself master of all its details.

Has your attention enabled you to discover whether there is any, and what difference between the grand jury system established by law in the city of Dublin, and those established in other parts of Ireland?—There is in one instance a distinction, and I think a most important one; the grand juries of the county of Dublin are limited in the sums they present; the grand juries of the city, in many instances, not at all.

That observation does not apply to the counties in general?—No, only to the county of Dublin.

Has your experience enabled you to know, whether a great many of those charges which annually come before the grand jury, are not matters of necessity?—I think that a large share of one of the largest sums that is presented for by the grand juries of the city of Dublin, is wholly unnecessary, that is, the fees to the clerks of the crown, and above all others, those to the clerks of the peace; I think the same observation applies to the medical expenses of the gaols.

Can you undertake to state positively, that the answer which you have just given with respect to the clerks of the peace is borne out by the letter of the law?—I cannot pretend to be a perfect judge of the law, but as far as I am informed and have read, it is not imperative on the grand juries to present the entire sums claimed by the clerks of the peace and of the crown; and I am certain that competent persons of the greatest respectability, would be found to discharge those duties for one third of the sums which the present town clerks receive.

Mr. John McMullen.

(6 May.)

Do you know that the judge can refuse, and often does refuse to fiat those presentments, which the grand jury make for lessening the payments to the clerks of the peace and the clerks of the crown?—I am not aware of the fact, nor have I ever heard that any such reduction was attempted in the city of Dublin by the grand jury; on the contrary, I am perfectly convinced that the majority of the grand jury, as at present constituted, would rather aid than retard the progressive and rapid augmentation of this tax, as long as they could continue to monopolize the patronage and profits of the system; this I can confidently assert, is the universal opinion of the inhabitants of Dublin upon the subject; and it is undeniable, that in this opinion they are borne out by all past experience.

Are you aware that the grand juries have very little control over the fees of the clerks of the crown, as well as the clerks of the peace?—I am not aware of any control which they can have in that respect, other than what I have just mentioned, and which, if rigidly exercised, would be very ample control.

Then the Committee are to understand, that it is your mere opinion, that a reduction in those charges might take place?—That is certainly my opinion, and it is founded upon my perfect knowledge that persons might be found, fully competent to do the duty which has been alluded to, and who would be willing to receive much smaller presentments.

With respect to the other charges of the grand jury, do not all the expenses of prisoners necessarily entail a great expense upon the citizens, without any great control being left to the grand jury?—A considerable portion of expense is no doubt unavoidable.

Have you any positive reason to suppose that the grand jury of the city of Dublin are less likely to attend to economy in those matters than the grand jury of any county in Ireland?—I certainly think the grand jury of the city of Dublin are much less likely to attend to economy in the levy of the public money than the grand juries in the counties, inasmuch as the grand jurors of the city of Dublin, with few exceptions, possess little property in the city, a considerable proportion of them do not even live within the limits of their own jurisdiction, and therefore they have, comparatively, no interest in protecting their own property, or that of their fellow citizens; while, on the contrary, I should suppose that a leading principle and object with gentlemen in the counties, would be to guard their own properties and those of their tenantry from useless or extravagant exaction.

You say that in many cases of presentments of the city of Dublin, the expense is unavoidable; are they in many cases, do you conceive, exorbitant and unnecessary?—I certainly do.

Do you recollect that you have ever heard of a single instance where a contract was given to the relative of a grand juror, when a tender of a lesser sum was made by a stranger?—I have never heard of any such circumstance, nor do I conceive it possible that I could hear of it if it occurred.

Did you ever see the advertisements for the contract published in the papers?—Yes, I have, but in one paper only.

What is the number of houses in the city of Dublin, which are rated for the payment of taxes?—The number rated for paving and lighting, within the boundary of the Circular Road, is 16,138.

Jovis, 8° *die Maii,* 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Isaac Stewart, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(8 May.)

IN what situation of life are you?—I am a merchant.

Where do you reside?—In Dublin.

How long have you resided there?—Since the year 1795, twenty-seven years.

Have you paid any attention to the local taxation of the city of Dublin?—Yes, I have.

What circumstances have induced you to pay attention to the local taxation of the city?—The very great increasing charge of the taxes, and decreasing capability of paying, and the decline of property in the city of Dublin. In the county of

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(8 May.)

of Dublin there has been a considerable decrease of prisoners during late years: namely, 544 in 1818 and 394 in 1820. In the county, the population increased from 110,437 in 1813, to 160,274 in 1821, being an increase of 49,837*; in the city of Dublin the population was 176,610 in 1813, and 186,276 in 1821, being an increase of 9,666; it therefore appears, that the increase of population in the city is, as one to every twenty souls, and in the county, as one to every three souls; I shall perhaps be more perfectly understood, if I state that the increase in the city, is at the rate of 5 per cent, and in the county at the rate of 33 per cent; that the number committed to Newgate in the year ending January 1818, was 1,991; and that ending January 1823, there were 2,183. I mention these facts, to show that the population are quitting Dublin, owing, as I believe, to the pressure of local taxes, and are taking houses in the county out of their reach; I also take leave to mention, that by a document †, furnished to Parliament the number of houses in the city in 1813, were 15,104; and in 1821, 16,005; showing an increase of nearly one to fifteen; and in the county there were in 1813, 16,633, and in 1821, 21,987; showing an increase nearly of one to three, being the relative proportion of increase of population. The houses in the city liable to pay grand jury cess, are 12,352, of which 4,576 are exempt or insolvent; and of course there must be 3,653 houses within the Circular Road not liable to grand jury cess; thus it will appear, that between houses exempt and insolvent, there were 8,229 in the year 1820; and I apprehend the number of insolvent houses are greatly increased since that period; it therefore cannot be a matter of uncertainty, that less than one-half of the houses in the city of Dublin, are obliged to bear the whole of the expense of gaols, roads and criminal prosecutions.

HOUSES IN DUBLIN.

1820:	Gross N° of HOUSES.	N° of HOUSES Insolvent.	HOUSES not subject to Tax.	HOUSES in the County.
Audeons - - - - -	417	43	36	
St. Andrew - - -	730	141	26	
St. Anne - - - -	720	109	25	
St. Bridget - - - -	645	134	37	
St. Catherine, City Liberty - -	352	121	- - -	343
D° - - Thomas Court Liberty	614	346	- - -	243
St. George being in County, not subject to grand jury cess.				
St. James - - - - -	315	113	45	
St. John - - - - -	316	124	30	
St. Luke, in County.				
St. Mark - - - - -	788	Computed 131		
St. Mary - - - - -	1,678	512	150	
St. Michael - - - -	87	10	10	
St. Michan - - - -	1,457	761	73	19
St. Nicholas within - - -	139	16	20	
St. Nicholas without - - -	484	87	- - -	166
St. Paul's - - - - -	714	294	10	
St. Peter's - - - -	1,209	185		
St. Thomas - - - -	1,450	633	300	
St. Werburgh's - - - -	237	54		
St. Mary's Donnybrook - -	—	—	—	—
	12,352	3,814	762	771

Number of Houses in Dublin liable to Grand Jury Cess - -		12,352
Number Insolvent - - - - - - -	3,814	
D° - - - not liable to pay, or exempt - -	762	
		4,576
Solvent, capable of paying Grand Jury Cess -		7,776

---

* See Census, vol. 14; 1822—p. 737.

† See Parish Reports, vol. 20; 1821—p. 439.

Have

Mr. Isaac Stewart. (8 May.)

Have those circumstances of late induced the citizens of Dublin, or many amongst them, to pay peculiar attention to the local taxation of the city?—They have.

In the attention which you have paid to the subject relating to the local taxation of the city of Dublin, have you acted individually or in co-operation with others?—In co-operation with others.

Who are those other persons?—There are a great number, there are sixteen individuals in St. Mary's parish, and I believe there are eight or nine other parishes which appointed committees.

Are Mr. M'Mullen and Mr. Purdy, who have been already examined before this Committee, individuals who, in conjunction with you, have been employed in investigating this subject?—They are.

Have you paid any attention to the subject of the grand jury assessments?—I have.

Have you any observations to make with regard to the individuals who compose the presenting term grand juries?—I have.

Have the goodness to state them?—The grand jury, what is called the presenting term grand jury in the city of Dublin, is constituted by the corporation of Dublin, and is chiefly composed of aldermen of the city, or members of the corporation.

By members of the corporation, you mean members of the common council?—Aldermen, sheriff's peers, or persons belonging to the corporation.

Do you mean to say that the grand juries of the city of Dublin are composed of members of the governing part of the corporation?—Certainly.

Are they not, generally speaking, the same individuals in successive grand juries?—Certainly.

Has the grand jury taxation augmented very considerably within the last eight or nine years?—It has, very considerably.

To what circumstance do you attribute that increase?—There are a great number of circumstances connected with the increase of the grand jury taxes; there is an increase in the number of individuals tried; there is an increase of salaries to the officers, and an increased number of prisons.

Are there any other circumstances to which you would attribute the increase of the grand jury taxation, besides those that you have stated?—I am not aware at present of any other.

Do you conceive the operation of the Police Act, and the extension of the recorder's jurisdiction, have contributed to the increase of the grand jury taxation?—That certainly has had a tendency to increase the number of prisoners committed to the prisons; the magistrates commit to Newgate to be tried, at the expense of the city, all prisoners taken within the jurisdiction of the recorder.

Then the extension of the jurisdiction of course increases the number of prisoners?—It does.

Are there any other causes, for instance, in the system of contracts pursued by the grand jury, do you conceive, that has augmented the local taxation?—I certainly do.

In what respect?—I think it appears generally in looking over the manner in which the contracts are made, that they are confined to the grand jurors themselves, or the relations of the grand jurors; that is, speaking of the gross amount of the contracts; there is, I conceive, a considerable degree of defectiveness in the examination of the articles supplied for the prisons, that is one cause of the increase of charge.

Is the supply furnished by open bidding, or by contract?—It is generally understood that individuals do not offer for contracts without some influence with the grand jury, unless it is for some small articles.

Are not they always advertised for public competition?—I have very seldom noticed an advertisement for any contract.

Are there instances in which you have noticed them?—I have occasionally.

Have you ever known an instance of the lowest contract being refused?—I have not.

Have you ever known an instance of an advertisement appearing for the supply of stationery for the grand jury?—I have not.

Do you consider that the objections to which you have alluded, with respect to contracts, arise out of the nature of the constitution of the individuals who form the grand jury?—I do.

Do you conceive, that if the grand jury were constituted on a more equal representation

Mr. Isaac Stewart. (8 May.)

sentation of the people of Dublin, that there would be contracts of a more open kind and more advantageous to the public?—I do.

On what reasons do you ground that belief?—Because another and a more numerous class of individuals, would then present themselves as contractors.

Having stated that the increase of grand jury assessment is in some degree connected with the increase of crime and of prisons, have you visited the prisons of Dublin?—Yes, I have; but I cannot make up my mind to believe that there is an increase of crime.

You have stated that there is an increase of prisoners, how do you account for an increase of prisoners without an increase of crime?—The increased number of prisoners, I am inclined to believe, proceeds from a desire on the part of many of those individuals that now are in the gaols to return again soon after being discharged, because they are better treated in Richmond bridewell and Smithfield penitentiary, than they could be any where else, by means of any provision which they could obtain for themselves.

Have any specific instances come to your knowledge which lead you to that belief?—Yes.

Will you state them?—I visited all the prisons in Dublin; and on a minute inspection of Newgate, I found a considerable number of those that are there confined for short periods of imprisonment; those tried and convicted in Newgate are imprisoned for six months or not exceeding six months; and among that class there appears to me almost two-thirds of them not come to the time of manhood, probably from fourteen to eighteen years of age; it appeared on looking at them, in a cursory way, in going through the gaol, that two-thirds of them might be called boys.

Was there any system of hard labour introduced amongst those boys?—None at all.

Do not you know, that all prisoners under fourteen are sent to the Smithfield penitentiary, and not to the Richmond bridewell?—I am aware that they are so sent to Smithfield penitentiary.

Do not you conceive, that the introduction of a proper system of discipline and hard labour, would prevent that anxiety to return to the prisons?—I am quite satisfied of that; I have observed the manner in which they were dressed, they appeared to be nearly naked, I do not recollect that I saw a dozen of them with shoes and stockings, and there were a hundred and sixty of them in a very small yard, which is the only place they have to walk in, and that is surrounded with very high walls; their cells were convenient to this place.

Can you inform the Committee of the number of persons in any of the prisons of Dublin, at any particular period?—Yes, I can; the number in all the prisons that I visited; in Newgate there were 311.

At what time?—On the 11th of January last; in Richmond bridewell 260, and in Smithfield penitentiary 138; I was just going to remark, with respect to the manner in which the prisoners conducted themselves; it appeared to me, that if any place might be called a seminary for the education of crime, I should take that end of Newgate to be that seminary; I asked the officers reason why they were so ill clad, and they said, that if they went there with good clothes on, the old prisoners would steal the good clothes from them.

Have you any knowledge of the medical expense of the different gaols?—I have.

Will you have the goodness to state it?—The whole medical expense in the gaols at Dublin in the year 1820, taken from a grand jury warrant of that year, appears to be 1,654*l.* 11*s.* 11*d.*; the first charge is for hospital keepers 42*l*; nurses 188*l.* 8*s.* 11*d*; medicine 384*l.* 19*s.* 7*d*; necessaries 501*l.* 13*s.* 5*d*; physicians 300*l*; and surgeons 227*l.* 10*s.*

What is meant by necessaries?—We never could understand anything about it; we never could get any explanation, though we applied for it.

Can you tell the amount in other years?—I have looked back at some of the other presentment sheets, and I do not perceive there is much difference.

Do you conceive there is any material difference between that and the former years you have examined into?—Of late years, I think not.

Can you give any information to the Committee, what the expense is for the medical services in any of the public hospitals of Dublin?—Yes, I can; I have a paper in my hand containing an account of the Meath hospital or county of Dublin infirmary.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(8 May.)

What are the medical expenses of that prison?—In 1819, 148*l.* 8*s.* 10½*d.*; in 1820, 173*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.*; in 1821, 197*l.* 1*s.*

Does that include medicines and salaries?—Medicine, wine, and all necessaries.

How many patients were admitted in those years?—In 1819, 503; in 1820, 499; in 1821, 548; and in 1822, 529. The number of external patients cannot be correctly ascertained, but may be fairly averaged at about 250 per day.

Can you give the Committee any information as to the medical expenses of any other, and what prisons, besides the prisons of Dublin?—In Tothill-fields prison, the medical expenses for the surgeon and apothecary, are 80*l.* a year.

Have you the average number of prisoners confined in Tothill-fields?—The officers of the prison told me there were about 2,000 in a year; that many of them were not committed, but were sent there by the magistrate, probably during an investigation.

Have you visited any other prisons?—I have visited Newgate in London, and Giltspur-street and the Borough compter; and I was informed by the officers at Newgate, that the surgeon had 400*l.* a year, and provided all medicines necessary for the three prisons just named.

Have you visited any other prisons?—Not in London.

Who provided you with that information?—The gaoler of Newgate and the governor of Giltspur-street; but the latter was not very sure, whether it was four or five hundred a year. I can mention a further expense for medical institutions in Dublin; there are Jarvis-street infirmary, Mercer's hospital, and the hospital for incurables; three institutions to which 650*l.* a year is paid by the grand jury.

Is this under any particular Act of Parliament compulsory?—I never heard of any Act of Parliament on the subject; they are paid in equal sums of 108*l.* 6*s.* 8*d*, each, half-yearly.

Will you give the Committee any information on that subject?—The expense of stationery for the city of Dublin, paid to Alderman Exshaw in 1820, for the grand jury, was 310*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*; and also 99*l.* 8*s.* 1*d.* to other individuals. I cannot distinguish the difference between what is for the term grand juries and what is for the sessions grand juries.

Have you compared those with expenses of a similar nature elsewhere?—I cannot say that I have very particularly.

Will you be so good as to inform the Committee, the items which you conceive chargeable under the head of stationery for the use of the grand jury of the city of Dublin?—Pens, ink and paper, and the printing of the warrants; I think those are the principals items, I am not aware of any others.

Have you ever heard that the stationer is paid for the stamps which are charged for the different presentments made by the grand jury of the city?—I have; I perceive there is a charge for stamps of 28*l.* 3*s.* 4*d*; I thought this very extraordinary, as in my experience, as an overseer of roads, in the county of Dublin, I always when making the affidavit, had to pay the cost of the stamps out of my own pocket.

You having stated, that you attribute the increase of grand jury presentments, in some degree, to the increase of salaries, will you have the goodness to state what salaries you allude to?—I allude to the increase of salary of the surgeon; it appears by the grand jury papers to have been one hundred guineas in 1807, and it has been for many years back two hundred guineas; that of the physician has been increased from 100*l.* which he was paid in 1807, to 400*l.* the sum he at present receives; and I see in one year, not very long back, that he was paid 100*l.* for attending at Kilmainham gaol extra, on account of some city of Dublin prisoners being removed there.

Was that in addition to his salary?—Yes.

Has he a permanent salary now of 400*l.* a year?—He has.

What is his name?—Dr. Harty; in Easter term 1819, I find the following, " Paid to Dr. William Harty, for attendance upon the city prisoners in Kilmainham gaol, 100*l.*"

With respect to this surgeon, you state that the surgeon's salary has been increased?—It has from one hundred guineas, in 1807, to two hundred guineas.

Are you aware of the cause of that increase?—I am not aware of any reasonable cause.

You say, that his salary in 1807, was one hundred guineas a year, and that it was increased to two hundred guineas a year in 1821?—It was increased soon after 1807.

Can

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(8 May.)

Can you state how many persons the surgeon was in the habit of attending in 1807?—No, I cannot exactly.

Do you know, whether the two most crowded prisons were not added to his charge between 1807, and the time of the increase of his salary?—No, I think not more than one; nor am I sure whether there was any addition, as I perceive there was a bridewell or a workhouse in James's street, and I am not very sure whether the physician appointed by government continues to attend the Smithfield penitentiary.

Are you aware that the Smithfield penitentiary was given up to the city of Dublin in the year 1818, and maintained since that time by the city?—I am informed, it was not given up till the 1st of January 1822.

Who was the surgeon to the gaols in 1818?—Surgeon Leake.

Are you aware that the Richmond bridewell has been established since 1807?—I am.

Does not it appear a very natural reason to you, that if a surgeon has to attend five prisons instead of three, his salary should be increased?—Very natural certainly; however, upon that point, I beg to state, that I examined the sick in those gaols particularly, with a view to satisfy myself, what occasion there was for such an extraordinary quantity of medicine, and so large a sum being expended in that department; I got a return in the three gaols of Newgate, the Smithfield penitentiary, and the Richmond bridewell, there were only thirty-four on the doctor's list on the day I attended, only one in Richmond bridewell, and none in Smithfield; I went into every one of their hospitals, and there was no person to say sick, save such as were ill with complaints which had been brought on by their own indiscretion.

Who is the present surgeon of the prisons?—I am informed Mr. Read.

Have you ever heard of his giving any pecuniary remuneration to his predecessor resigning in his favour?—I have; it is a circumstance of great notoriety, it is talked of in a great many places, and not disputed or contradicted, that he has paid 500 *l.* and agreed to give a moiety of any increase of salary to Mr. Leak to resign in his favour. This Mr. Read is son-in-law to Mr. Long the police magistrate, and it was reported that there is reasonable prospect of an increase on the appointment of any person connected with the corporation of the city; and that as Mr. Read was son-in-law to Mr. Long the police magistrate, there was reasonable prospect of an increase to his salary; Mr. Leak had one hundred guineas in the year 1807.

You state that in the event of the surgeon's salary being increased, something was to happen; what was that?—In the event of the present surgeon getting an increase, the late surgeon was to receive a moiety of that increase in addition to the 500 *l.*

Do you know who the relations of Mr. Leak were upon the grand jury?—I believe he had none at all.

Are there any relations of Mr. Read upon the grand jury?—There is his father-in-law, Mr. Long, the police magistrate, and through him connected with several others.

Is he a member of the corporation, and in the habit of attending grand juries?—Yes, he is; I see his name frequently on the grand jury.

Do you know whether the circumstance of Mr. Leak's selling the office was ever stated to the grand jury?—I am not aware of it.

From your experience in the medical attendance necessary for prisons, do you not think that one medical attendant, namely, either a surgeon or a physician, would be sufficient to attend the prisons of the city of Dublin?—I do; I have already mentioned the sum paid to three hospitals, namely, 650 *l.*; they are very excellent institutions, and I am quite satisfied that if the grand jury made a point to discontinue that annual grant, unless they attended to the duties of the prisons and agreed to supply them with medicines, &c. that rather than be deprived of this annual grant, they would supply medicine and medical advice without any charge whatever.

Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the expense of the town clerk's office of the city of Dublin?—I perceive in a return made by the town clerks themselves, they had in 1816 a salary of 724 *l.* and fees to the amount of 1,017 *l.* 5 *s.* 9 *d.*; the salary has been continued from 1816 up to 1821, and there is a remarkable occurrence with respect to that; I was on one of those juries, and it was said we had no discretion with respect to those fees, and on reference to the Act of Parliament, it appears that the grand jury may give a reasonable compensation; they are not to exceed a certain sum, but they may give reasonable compensation;

Mr. Isaac Stewart.
(8 May.)

sation; my attention was called to this, in consequence of a communication I had with a gentleman on my way to London, he said the grand jury of the county of Cavan paid their officers a certain sum yearly instead of those fees.

Are you acquainted with any public mercantile establishments of Dublin, such as the Bank of Ireland?—Yes, I am.

Are many of the individuals who are accustomed to serve upon the presenting grand juries members of any of those establishments?—I never knew an alderman of the city of Dublin elected to the Bank of Ireland, there is, however, one there now, but I believe he has been made an alderman since he was elected a director of the bank.

Do you know when Mr. Read the surgeon was appointed?—I think within the last two years.

From your own experience, you are not enabled to say how far the grand jury have any discretion in limiting the fees of the clerks of the peace?—No, I have not; but on looking at the Acts of Parliament I observe that reasonable compensation may be given, and that it is not mandatory on the grand jury, to present to the utmost extent of the fees named in the several Acts.

You are aware that it is imperative upon the presenting grand juries, either of Easter or Michaelmas term, to present the presentments which have been sanctioned by the presentments made at the sessions?—I am aware that the term grand jury, or what is known by the name of the jobbing grand jury, usually present for the presentments at sessions.

Are you acquainted with the names of the individuals who have been accustomed to serve for many years consecutively upon grand juries?—Yes, I am.

Are you acquainted with the names of the contractors and public officers of the grand jury in Dublin?—Yes, I am.

Can you state whether, between those individuals who are accustomed to serve upon grand juries, and those officers and contractors, there exists any close degree of relationship or connection, or do any of them supply articles for the use of the prisons?—There is a Mr. Craven, a grand juror, who supplies the medicine himself, and has done so for a number of years; Alderman Exshaw has supplied the stationery, and Alderman Read, a grand juror, supplied lead and plumbers' work in his line of trade.

What is Alderman Read?—He is a plumber; a man of the name of Stoddart appears to have been a contractor for linen and blankets.

Was he a grand juror or related to a grand juror?—He is frequently a grand juror; Alderman Nugent also appears to have supplied blankets in his own name; and it appears by part of one of those warrants, that three individuals were appointed commissioners for certain purposes, Alderman Warner was one of them; he was a clock-maker, and part of the business they were to do was to furnish a clock for the new bridewell, and I am informed that 370 *l.* was the cost of it; there is, however, no document whatever before the public that I have seen or am acquainted with, which shows the whole expense of that building; Doctor Harty is brother to Alderman Harty, and brother-in-law to Alderman M'Kenny; Mr. Montgomery is secretary to the grand jury, and when I come to that, I beg the indulgence of the Committee, to mention a matter relating to him; it appears that his salary in 1807, was 200 *l.* and for the last several years it appears to have been 380 *l.*; and this Mr. Montgomery is also an attorney by profession, and he appears to have been paid for disbursements and bills of costs, commencing in 1807 and ending in Michaelmas 1820, twenty-seven different bills, amounting to 5,520 *l.* 10 *s.* 8 *d.* I took the following sums out of the fourteen years grand jury warrants now on this table, which I beg to hand in to the Committee.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(8 May.)

		£.	s.	d.
“ 1807:	In Easter Term	206	15	2
	Michaelmas	778	9	11
1808:	Hilary	304	11	6½
	Trinity	266	15	9
1809:	Easter	591	10	7
	Michaelmas	126	15	8
1810:	Easter	257	8	4½
	Michaelmas	139	6	10
1811:	Easter	223	11	8
	Michaelmas	142	8	1½
1812:	Easter	148	–	2
	Michaelmas	112	7	10½
1813:	Easter	243	6	–
	Michaelmas	111	14	6
1814:	E. Sessions	78	12	7
	Midsummer	155	9	7
1815:	Easter			
	Michaelmas	93	9	4
1816:	Easter*	97	11	8
	Michaelmas	176	18	2
1817:	Easter	124	16	6
	Michaelmas	127	11	8
1818:	Easter	55	14	–
	Michaelmas	180	2	5
1819:	Easter	359	6	11
	Michaelmas	110	18	–
1820:	Easter	227	11	8
	Michaelmas	69	3	2
		£. 5,520	10	8

Fourteen years, average 394 *l.* 6 *s.* 5 *d.* per year.

* N.B.—In Easter 1815, the names of the grand jurors are not given.

Mr. Darly the grand jury treasurer is also an attorney, his salary in 1807, appears to have been 250 *l.* and in 1822 it is 500 *l.*; Mr. Bourne the gaoler of Newgate is brother-in-law, or closely connected by marriage to Alderman Archer, and Purdon the governor of Richmond bridewell, is son-in-law to Alderman Archer; those are all that I recollect or can name at present.

Do you know that all contracts for the supply of prisoners, are advertised for public bidding?—No, I am not aware of that.

Did you ever see an advertisement in the paper?—Yes, I have, but very seldom.

Have you ever heard any thing against the manner in which those different officers have executed their duty, such as the treasurer, gaoler and those officers whom you state to be connected with the members of the grand jury?—With respect to the treasurer and the gaoler individually, I have not; but there are officers I have heard great objections to, and that induced me to inquire into the articles supplied by a Mr. Dalton, and beg to mention a fact that I happen to know of my own knowledge; on visiting Newgate I examined some of the articles, and also the pattern by which the contract was made, and particularly the article of linen, and can state that the parcel was not of the same description of linen in two respects, it was something whiter, and not of any thing like so good a quality as the pattern.

When was that?—In January last.

Does your trade lead you to be a judge of that article?—I have exported some thousand pounds worth of linen.

Sir Robert Shaw, Baronet, a Member of the Committee, Examined.

Sir *Robert Shaw.* (8 May.)

HAVE you been long acquainted with the city of Dublin?—Yes, twenty-five years at least.

Have you served upon grand juries in the city of Dublin?—I have occasionally, but not often on the grand juries of the city.

When did you first serve upon a grand jury of the city?—That I cannot charge my memory with.

Was your first summons to the grand jury of the city of Dublin, at or about the time of your reaching corporate rank in the city?—Not before, certainly.

What corporate rank do you allude to?—Common councilman.

Had you represented the city of Dublin, previously to your serving upon grand juries of the city?—Yes, I had.

Although representative for the city of Dublin, and residing there, you were not summoned upon the grand juries of the city of Dublin, until you had became a common councilman?—I was not.

Do you know any instances in your experience of the grand juries of the city of Dublin, in which individuals not being common councilmen, or of the higher class of the corporation, are summoned upon those grand juries?—I believe they are occasionally summoned, but I never knew an instance of one of them having an opportunity of serving upon a grand jury, when the aldermen and sheriff's peers attended in their order.

Then the aldermen, sheriff's peers and common councilmen, constitute exclusively the presenting grand juries of the city of Dublin?—I think they generally do, they always would if they attended in order, as they are always the first called.

Individuals resident in the city of Dublin, however high their rank, and considerable their property, are not sworn upon that grand jury unless they are possessed of that corporate rank?—Certainly not; I never knew an instance of Mr. Grattan, so long as he was my colleague, being summoned upon it, or of Mr. Ellis, who is my present colleague, being summoned upon it.

Do the same individuals, generally speaking, constitute the grand juries of the city of Dublin?—Generally, with a very small variation; I am speaking entirely of the presenting grand juries.

Are you aware of any law, either general or municipal, which confines the presenting grand juries to the members of the corporation?—No, I am not, except that it is always at the discretion of the sheriff, who invariably chooses persons of that rank.

By whom is the sheriff appointed?—By the corporation, by the commons and aldermen.

Then the sheriffs are appointed by the individuals, whom the sheriffs in turn appoint as grand jurors?—Certainly.

What is your rank at present in the corporation?—An alderman.

As alderman, is it not your duty at times to assist the recorder in the discharge of his public functions?—Very often.

Is it competent to the recorder to open his court and proceed to business without the attendance of one or two aldermen?—It is not competent for him to open his court without the attendance of two aldermen.

Have you ever known any inconvenience result to the public from that circumstance?—I have certainly observed very considerable inconvenience, in one or two instances when I have attended, being punctual to the hour appointed, we have remained sometimes for hours together, without being able even to send a witness up to the grand jury to be examined.

In point of fact, are not the criminal functions of that court administered by the recorder?—He always consults the sitting magistrates with him, as to the quantum of punishment, but all the legal questions are entirely decided by him.

Does not the delay which you have alluded to, create difficulty in the gaol delivery, and consequently add to the expense of maintaining the criminals in prison?—It certainly does.

Does not the responsibility of selecting grand juries, rest entirely with the sheriff?—Entirely.

In that respect it does not differ from the constitution of grand juries in counties?—Not the least.

Then do you conceive, as the responsibility rests upon one person, whether, if the

Sir Robert Shaw.

(8 May.)

nature of the constitution of the corporation of the city of Dublin were altered, that a better description of persons would be likely to be presented by the sheriffs under that constitution, than under the present?—It is very difficult for me to answer, exactly, but I am quite sure it would give great satisfaction to the citizens of Dublin, if there was some regulation made, by which the corporation should not always have a majority.

Have you ever heard of any complaint in the counties of Ireland, of the exclusive power which is given to the sheriffs of nominating the grand jury?—I do not recollect hearing any thing about it.

Having been asked with regard to the constitution of grand juries in counties, as proceeding from the sheriff, do you not conceive that the predominance of the members of the corporation on the city of Dublin presenting grand juries, arises out of the circumstance of the sheriff being a corporate officer, appointed by the individuals whom he in turn nominates upon the grand jury?—I do.

Do you conceive, if there was a sheriff in Dublin appointed by the crown, that the selection of presenting grand juries would be the same, or different from what it now is?—I should suppose, if the sheriff was appointed by the crown, he would look to the property of the city, more than to corporate rank.

Have you heard a very general complaint amongst the citizens of Dublin, of the exclusive manner in which the nomination of grand juries is maintained?—I have heard the citizens complain very much, that respectable individuals not connected with the corporation, are entirely excluded from the grand juries.

Do they not complain, that they are taxed in a very serious manner, without having any thing to do with the nomination of those persons who tax them?—They do certainly.

Does your experience as a grand juror, enable you to give much information to the Committee, with respect to the manner in which business is transacted by the grand juries?—I have not attended more than two or three times on the city grand juries.

Then you are not prepared to give very specific information as to the mode of examining the accounts?—No, I am not.

Has it ever happened to you to attend the grand jury, when any office in the gift of the grand jury has been vacant?—I do not recollect that it has.

Have you ever heard a canvass going on in the grand jury room?—Never when I was attending.

Are you acquainted with the names of the officers of the grand jury, and the individuals receiving presentments from the grand jury?—Yes, I am.

Are many of those individuals either grand jurors or immediate connections with grand jurors?—They are, certainly.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

Mr. Richard Purdy, again called in; and Examined.

ARE there any circumstances which you wish to explain in your former evidence, if there are, will you have the goodness to state them shortly to the Committee?—I was anxious to explain to the Committee, that I find a number of presentments to the inspector for the supply of necessaries in the several terms: in Easter term 1816, for blankets, &c. 182 *l.* 0 *s.* 4 *d.*; in Michaelmas 1817, for ticks, sheets and rugs, 60 *l.*; in Michaelmas 1818, for providing provisions &c. 650 *l.*; in Easter 1819, for furniture, looms, &c. 784 *l.* 3 *s.*; in Michaelmas 1819, for necessaries, 245 *l.*; and in Easter 1820, for necessaries, 684 *l.* 11 *s.* 11 *d.*; I also find various presentments to the treasurer for necessaries; in Michaelmas 1817, 760 *l.*; in Easter 1818, 750 *l.*; in Easter term 1819, 888 *l.* 16 *s.* 9 *d.*; and in Michaelmas 1820, 283 *l.* 2 *s.* 11 *d.*; in Michaelmas term 1821, the contract was made with Mr. Dalton, for 335 *l.* and Alderman Nugent was one of the jury; and in Easter 1822, there were two presentments, making together 157 *l.* 2 *s.* 8 *d.* to Charles Thorp, one of 96 *l.* 19 *s.* 11 *d.* the other of 58 *l.* 5 *s.* 8 *d.*; upon that occasion, Charles Thorp appears to be upon the jury; and in Easter Term 1822, there is a presentment for potatoes to Richardson, to which I have referred, sixty tons of potatoes at 6 *l.* per ton, 360 *l.*

Is there anything else?—In Michaelmas 1822, there are five presentments to Charles Thorp the sheriff, making 148 *l.* 2 *s.* 11 *d.* and one to the inspector, for necessaries, 60 *l.* I wish also to state, that Richard Ellis, a collector of grand jury cess, appears to have been a defaulter, in Easter term 1816, and I have heard that the

the deficiency exceeded 1,200*l.*; and that Isaac Manders, son of Alderman Manders was uniformly the contractor for bread so long as he continued in trade, and that in one year of that period, 1817, the sum presented to Isaac Manders for bread, was 3,758*l.* 9*s.* 11*d.* equal to nearly 4*d.* per day for each prisoner.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(8 May.)

Veneris, 9° *die Maii*, 1823.

SIR ROBERT SHAW, BARONET,

IN THE CHAIR.

The Rev. Piers Robert Gamble, called in; and Examined.

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

WHAT is your profession?—I am a clergyman of the established church.

What public official situation do you hold, and how long have you held it?—I have been inspector of gaols of the city of Dublin since the year 1814, and curate of St. Michan's parish.

By whom, and why were you appointed to the office of inspector of prisons?—I was appointed by the grand jury of the city of Dublin, in compliance with the 50th Act of the late king, chapter 103.

Do you owe your appointment to any favour or friendship of any person who has been in the habit of serving upon the grand jury?—No, I do not.

Is not your appointment specially under the Act of Parliament?—It is; the grand jury being bound to select the inspector from amongst the Protestant clergy of the parish.

What salary was attached to your office at the time of your appointment, and what now?—The salary attached to my office, at the time of my appointment, was 200*l.* a year and ten pounds; now it is 400*l.* and ten pounds a year.

State the reason of the first increase of salary, and the time at which it took place?—The first increase of my salary was in consequence of the then very crowded state of Newgate, which obliged the court of King's Bench to order the removal of convicts to Kilmainham gaol; and I received an order from the court to attend on the convicts there, which created so much trouble, that the grand jury increased my salary from 200*l.* to 300*l.* a year.

Your salary is now 400*l.* a year?—It is.

What is the difference between the duties now to be performed and at the time of the first increase?—I think the duties now to be performed are six times greater than they were at the time of my first appointment, and four times greater than they were at the time of the first increase of my salary.

Had you any relatives on the grand jury at either time?—No, I had not.

State the number of prisons that were under the management of the grand jury at the time of your appointment to the office, and the number of prisons under the management of the grand jury at present?—At the time of my appointment to the office of inspector, there were three prisons; the prison of Newgate, the sheriff's prison, and the city Marshalsea; there was likewise a bridewell in James's-street, in which there were about forty or fifty prisoners, most of them monthly prisoners, committed by the magistrates.

What are the number of prisons now under your superintendence?—There are the three that I have mentioned in Green-street, Richmond bridewell at Harold's-cross in the circular road, and the Smithfield penitentiary in Smithfield.

State the number of prisoners contained in the three prisons at the time of your first appointment, compared with the number of prisoners contained in the different gaols at present?—The three prisons in Green-street, I think, then contained—Newgate about 120, or from that to 150; the sheriff's prison, from 70 to 100; and the city Marshalsea, about 60.

State the number at present?—Newgate contains 300 prisoners; the city Marshalsea contains about 60; the sheriff's prison about 60; Richmond bridewell about 300, on an average; and Smithfield penitentiary, on an average, about 150.

What induced the grand jury to make the last increase to your salary?—It was in consequence of a letter I received from the court of King's Bench that they increased it.

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

Did you not find the duty so oppressive, and so multifarious, that you thought yourself entitled to ask from the grand jury, an increase of salary of from 300*l.* to 400*l.*?—I did.

Did the grand jury comply with your request?—They did not.

Did not you subsequently apply to the judges, stating the great increase of your duties, and the justice of your demand, in expecting an increase of salary?—I did.

What was the answer of the judge to your application?—I have the letter from Judge Jebb.

Will you have the goodness to put in that letter.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

My dear Sir,

I gave your papers to the chief justice to-day, and am sorry it will not be in my power to return them to you before to-morrow morning, which I hope to do at the sitting of the court. I mentioned the circumstance, both to his lordship and Judge Burton, and they are of opinion, that the very great additional labour, thrown upon you by the increase of prisoners and prisons, entitles you to an additional remuneration; such is my own opinion, and if the grand jury should, as I hope they will, make a presentment for an increased salary, I think I may say, it will be fiated by the court. In recommending economy to the grand jury in my charge, it was far from my intention to advise them to deny a fair remuneration for services: this would be injustice, and it is by a system of strict economy that they will be able to do justice, by remunerating services in due proportion to their value. I can safely bear testimony to the zeal with which you have discharged your important duties, and it will afford me great satisfaction, to find that the grand jury concur in my opinion.

I am, dear Sir, your very obedient servant,

Thursday Evening, 2d May 1822. *Richard Jebb.*

P.S. The chief justice is in possession also, of Dr. Harty's memorial, and our opinion is quite in favour of it also.

Is not that to be considered as the opinion of the court of King's Bench, upon the propriety of increasing your salary?—Certainly.

Was not a recommendation in consequence of that, made by the court to the grand jury, to make a presentment for the increase of your salary?—No, I am not aware of any special order for it, but the grand jury communicated with the court, which they do constantly on the subject, and they assented to the measure.

Then you obtained an increase of salary?—I then obtained an increase of salary.

Have you ever received any testimonies of approbation of your conduct, from the grand jury?—I have received the thanks of the grand jury, but I have no document to show to that purpose, and from committees of the grand jury, frequently.

Have you received any letters from persons in public situations, with whom you have had official business to transact, approving of your general conduct, as inspector?—Yes, I have.

Will you put in any document of that description?—I have here a note from the late chief justice, the present Lord Downes.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

Sir, February 22d, 1822.

I shall not fail to acquaint the new chief justice, that I am of opinion that he may have a perfect reliance on your zeal and activity in executing the duties of your office of inspector of prisons; and return you my sincere thanks for your exertions, and for your enabling me to speak so strongly of your merits to my lord chief justice; and am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Rev. Mr. Gamble. *W. Downes.*

Have you any other document?—Here is a letter from the late inspector-general of prisons.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

My

Rev. *P. R. Gamble.*

(9 May.)

My dear Sir, 78, Camden-street, 26th January 1822.

I received the return of the male and female convicts in Newgate, drawn in a very succinct form, for which I am much obliged, it is the last, I believe, I shall have occasion to trouble you for, as I am retired from the office of inspector-general of prisons for some weeks. Though our official communication may have ceased, I trust that our friendly intercourse may long continue.

I cannot conclude our correspondence, without expressing the many obligations I have felt myself under to you, for your zealous co-operation and careful attention with which you discharged the duties of your laborious and arduous office, as inspector of the gaols of Dublin.

Since the year 1814, the improvements that have been made in the different gaols, are attributable to the lively interest you took in every thing relating to those prisons, and the comforts of their unfortunate inmates; in proof that the demeanour of those wretched beings has been ameliorated under your superintendence, for the last three years, scarcely a complaint has reached me from the worst of them; Newgate, which formerly was a scene of continual disturbance, has been of late made conspicuous for tranquillity, good order and cleanliness, and doubt not that the good example you have given, and the discipline you have established, will be long continued by yourself and successors in the office.

I am, my dear Sir,

With best wishes for your prosperity, your faithful humble Servant,

Forster Archer.

Will you be so good as to state to the Committee, the official situation in which you stood to the inspector-general?—He had an official control over me, to whom I was obliged to make parliamentary and other returns.

Does not the law impose a fine upon you for neglecting to make such returns?—It does.

Have you ever incurred such a fine?—No.

Have you any further documents from any other public officer?—I have a certificate here, from the magistrates of the head office.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

The Reverend Mr. Gamble, inspector of Dublin prisons, having applied to the magistrates of the head office of police for a certificate, relative to his duty at the Richmond bridewell and Smithfield penitentiary, I am directed by them to state, that his attendance is constant, his attention unremitting, and that his duty as inspector is much increased.

22d April 1822. By order, *C. Tod,* Sec^{y}.

Have you any document from Dr. Trevor, inspector of convicts?—I have.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

My dear Sir, Cove, 7th March 1823.

I have much pleasure to tell you, that the vessel with Dublin convicts made a very quick passage to this place, only thirty hours; the wind changed on their arrival, and still continues unfavourable from Dublin; the convicts would now be there had I not taken measures at the time I did; I have to thank you for your assistance and promptness in having the clothing supplied to the city of Dublin prisoners, which is of so good a quality (and in consequence of the quick passage) as to enable me to tranship those prisoners without changing it, except only their shirts, for cleanliness. If all the prisoners sent from the different counties were supplied with clothing conformable to the official letter, which in justice, I must say, has been practised in Newgate, it would be attended with considerable saving of expense to the public; you will be pleased, when I tell you, that none of the prisoners (235) seemed to have suffered in their health by the passage to this place.

To the Rev. P. Gamble. (signed) *Edward Trevor.*

Will you deliver in the official regulations that are alluded to in that letter?

[*The witness delivered in the same, which are as follow:*]

Gentlemen, Dublin Castle, 27th February 1823.

I am commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to signify his Excellency's desire that you will immediately transmit the several convicts named in the enclosed list, now under sentence, rule, or order of transportation, in the gaol of your county, to the

Pigeon

Rev.
P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

Pigeon House dock, to be embarked on board the vessel engaged to convey them to Cork; orders are given to the commanding officers of the troops along your route, to furnish you with such parties of the military as you shall judge necessary for the safe conduct of the prisoners.

Previously to the removal of the prisoners from the gaol, you are to cause them to be examined, and any who from ill health may not be able to undertake the journey, you are not to transmit until further order, and, in such case, you will please to send me a certificate, on oath, from the physician or surgeon who shall have inspected the prisoners.

The convicts are to be thoroughly cleansed, and their hair cut close, and to be sufficiently clothed, previously to their being removed, agreeably to the annexed list.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,
Your most obedient humble servant.
W. Gregory.

To the Sheriffs of the city of Dublin, &c. &c. &c.

A grey jacket.
A pair of half bleached strong ticken trowsers, lined, and buttons at the sides.
Two pair of stockings.
A pair of shoes.
Two shirts.
A neck handkerchief.
A leather cap or hat.
And a strong bag to hold the spare articles.

Particular care to be taken that the convicts do not dispose of any of their clothing on the road.

Have you any fees or emoluments whatever arising from your office, in addition to your salary as inspector?—None.

In whose power is it to remove you from your office, if any complaints of misconduct should be made?—The King's Bench only.

Are you in any way concerned in the purchase of any articles under the grand jury?—Not at present, except in some trifling petty expenses.

You have been?—I have been formerly.

What money formerly passed through your hands?—I could tell exactly by reference: I should think at the rate of about 800 *l.* a year formerly.

Was not the grand jury authorized by the 63d section of the 50th of the late King to leave such sums in your hands for expenditure in the prisons?—They were.

Is this money paid in advance, or otherwise?—It is said to be paid in advance, but the case is decidedly otherwise.

How long could this money, according to the manner in which such money is paid under the grand jury assessment, remain in your hands?—If actually paid in advance, it could remain for six months only; but as it has been paid, it has never remained in my hands two months.

What is your mode of accounting for it?—The first person that I account to is the inspector of accounts, to whom I must produce a book with every document relative to the expenditure of the money, and receipt for every sum; he must check that book, and I must then on a stamp, produce to the grand jury the account signed by the inspector that it is all correct and compared with the vouchers in every respect; the grand jury then in discretion, either allow or disallow those accounts; it is before the whole grand jury, not a Committee; the account must then be sworn to before two magistrates, and submitted to the court for their fiat.

Has it happened that any public money often remains in your hands as a balance, after the closing of such accounts?—Certainly not.

Has it often happened that you are very much in advance for the payment of different articles, furnished for the supply of the prisons?—I have been very often.

If a balance should remain in your hands, how is that balance appropriated?—It is re-presented in the next sum that is required.

Was the public money that passed through your hands for the expenditure of the prisons, accounted for to the public officers in the usual manner?—It was.

Are your books ready to prove these circumstances?—They are.

Do you challenge the most full inquiry and examination of your accounts, as inspector of prisons?—I do, the fullest inquiry.

You have stated, that the law of the 50th of the late King, leaves to your discretion, the

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

the power of employing certain sums of money for the maintenance of prisoners, when grand juries have not made contracts for that purpose?—I have discretion.

Do you not conceive under that law, that you are entitled to purchase from any other individuals you please, and that you are required to inspect, to oversee and regulate the procuring and providing of bread, meat, potatoes or such other food as you shall judge most proper, for every person confined under your inspection, who shall stand in need of such assistance?—Yes, for such articles as have not been provided for by contract.

Do not you conceive that the law allows you to exercise your discretion in purchasing such articles, provided you do not purchase them from a grand juror, from yourself, from a chaplain, from the physician, from the surgeon or apothecary, or from the keeper of the prison?—It does.

Do you not conceive, that you are therefore entitled by law to purchase those articles from any other person at the usual market price, without any disadvantage to the public?—Certainly.

It has been stated that your mother-in-law had a farm in the neighbourhood of Dublin, and that you had a certain quantity of potatoes from her; that those potatoes were sent into Newgate in a very improper state, unfit to be given to the prisoners; that it is supposed, though not directly charged, that they were bought at a greater price than those purchased in the market, and that your mother-in-law had the direct advantage of such a sale; is that true?—It is certainly true, that I did purchase potatoes from my mother-in-law, to the amount in quantity (I can decidedly speak to the quantity in the course of three years) I think about fifteen ton in three years, indeed not so much.

Had you any interest, either directly or indirectly in the produce of that farm?—Most undoubtedly not, in any one way.

In what quantities did you usually get potatoes for the prison?—About three tons once a week.

From your experience of the markets of Dublin, do you not find it difficult to get so large a quantity at one time?—I have frequently found it very difficult to purchase potatoes in the market; because I could not get the large quantity I wanted, from any one person; therefore I had to buy a quarter of a ton or half a ton from one person, and a quarter of a ton from another person; and therefore I made it a rule when I purchased, to buy the quantity I wanted from any one person, who could supply the whole of that quantity.

Did you not conceive yourself justified by law, in making that purchase from your mother-in-law?—Certainly.

Did you purchase them at the market price?—My mode of acting, when I purchased them from a private person, was to go to market and get the highest and the lowest price, and take the medium.

Did you furnish the best potatoes at the medium price?—I did decidedly.

Were the potatoes supplied by your mother-in-law of that description, and at the same price?—Yes.

Did you conceive yourself as inspector, doing any thing more improper in buying those potatoes of your mother-in-law, than in buying them of any other individual?—I did not, certainly.

Were the prisoners equally well supplied by that purchase, and was the interest of the public equally well consulted?—I never heard a complaint from the prisoners on the subject, and I think the public were rather served by it than otherwise.

Then the Committee are to understand, that the statement that has been made, as to your purchasing potatoes from your mother-in-law's farm, is perfectly true, but that you had no interest, directly or indirectly, in that farm?—I had no interest directly or indirectly in my mother-in-law's farm.

Are the Committee to understand, that those potatoes were sent into the prison in a proper condition?—Decidedly.

Were they picked potatoes?—Most undoubtedly.

The small were selected from the large?—The small were selected, and none but the large sent in.

Was the clay washed from them?—I cannot say; in Ireland they never are; the gaoler, however, can answer that question; and I have sent for a certificate, which I shall lay before the Committee when it arrives.

(Copy.)

We certify, that during the period the prison of Newgate was supplied with potatoes by the Rev. Piers Gamble, no complaints whatever existed, or could be made of the

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

the quality, as none but of the best quality was sent in by him, either from the public markets or elsewhere; we do not recollect a murmur to have been made by the prisoners until after they were supplied by contract, and since then frequent complaints have been made, and much inconvenience has occurred to the prisoners, and to the officers of the prison, the latter having been obliged often to return the potatoes sent by a contractor.

Dublin, 10th May 1823.
(A true copy.)

Jas Horner, Presbyterian Chaplain.
Fred Bourne, Gaoler.

Did you ever hear, before you attended this Committee as a witness, of any charge of misconduct against you for that transaction?—Never.

According to the 50th of the King, if any improper charge had been made by you, would a representation to the court of King's Bench necessarily have induced an inquiry into your conduct?—Decidedly, I should think so.

Does it not rest with the court of King's Bench to deprive you of your office, on proof of your misconduct?—Certainly.

What are the checks appointed by law upon you, in the purchase, distribution and management of the provisions and other articles for the prisoners?—Whenever I purchased articles for the prisons, they are liable to be inspected by other officers; they may be inspected by the physician, by the three chaplains, by the gaoler, and by the clerk.

Have you any reason to suppose that such an inspection was neglected by those officers at the time that this transaction took place?—No, I have not.

Was there any complaint made by those officers of your conduct?—None in the world.

Was any complaint made by the prisoners themselves?—I cannot charge my memory with any; but if a complaint had been made by the prisoners, it would have called down directly the investigation of some of the authorities.

Have you any means of checking a complaint on the part of the prisoners?—None in the world; the prisoners can complain to whom they please, and paper is given to them when asked.

Are prisoners in the habit of making complaint to you respecting the mode of supply in the prisons?—Sometimes they do.

If you are absent, they have the right also of making complaint to other officers?—They have.

Then, from the silence which has been observed respecting this transaction, from the time it took place up to this period, have you any reason to suppose that your conduct was blameable?—Not in the least; I never heard the transaction mentioned before.

According to the letter of the law, did not you think yourself perfectly justified to use your discretion in making the purchase of such potatoes, from your mother-in-law, as well as from any other person?—According to the letter of the law, I think I might have used my discretion in purchasing them from her as well as from any other person.

Then the Committee are to understand, that the articles were equally good, and supplied at as cheap a rate as if they had been purchased in the market?—Decidedly at as cheap a rate; as to the goodness of them, I never heard a word against it in my life.

Were not you of course purchasing for the public, and were you not bound to purchase in the best way, in the cheapest way that you could, and in the way least liable to suspicion?—Certainly, I should think so.

Do you consider that it was quite an unsuspicious act in a public functionary, to buy potatoes for the use of the prisoners, from his mother-in-law?—I declare I had no consideration that it was an improper act, or even a suspicious one, as there was no concealment in the case.

Would not you consider it a suspicious act in another?—I should not.

Would you advise another to do it?—I should not certainly, after what I have heard on this Committee.

But without having heard that, would not you think, that a man in a public trust should keep himself from suspicion?—If I may be allowed to answer the question clearly, I do not think that it could possibly make me, or any person liable to suspicion, to purchase five or six tons of potatoes from my mother-in-law in a year, when so large a quantity was bought by me in the course of a year as 150 tons.

Then it was five or six tons only, that you bought of your mother-in-law?—Five

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

or six tons only in a year, and I think the amount in the three years did not exceed fifteen tons; I am quite positive it did not amount to seventeen tons, in the three years; and the whole quantity purchased by me in that time was 450 tons.

Do you know what quantity of potatoes you purchased altogether in a year?—I think, about three tons in a week; 150 tons in a year.

Then you purchased 450 tons in three years, and out of that you bought from fifteen to eighteen tons from your mother-in-law?—I did; I can speak decidedly to that quantity, and the reason why I speak so decidedly is, the recollection that I have of the arrangements of my mother-in-law's small farm of fourteen acres.

Was an entry of the payment made in your books?—Always.

Did not more public money formerly pass through your hands, than passes now?—Much more.

Was it not at your own suggestion that less public money passes through your hands now, than formerly?—It originated with myself.

Did not that arise from your own feeling, that you did not wish to have the control or management of the public money?—I told the fact to the secretary of the grand jury, and conferred with him on the subject, and therefore, by his kindness, I was relieved from the disbursement of public money, and it was a very great inconvenience to me, at all times, to have charge of it; I could state and show that it would be a serious inconvenience to any one to have it.

Has not the court of King's Bench, since your declining to have the management of the public money, requested you to undertake it again, for the purpose of expediting the mode of payment?—In one instance they did, but not for expediting the mode of payment, but for the purpose of saving.

Did you decline?—I did.

Did your declining arise from the same motive?—It did, decidedly.

What is understood by the petty expenses which you are in the habit of paying?—They are enumerated under the head of lime for Newgate, brooms for Newgate, washing for the hospitals of the different prisons, and in case of the prisoners dying, for their burial fees, a coffin, and other little petty charges that might occur.

Did you account for all those petty expenses, in the same minute and circumstantial manner, in which you accounted for the expenditure of money for the supply of necessaries?—I did; indeed I should do it; I have never had 100*l.* public money in my hands for five hours, it has been always due before it has been paid to me.

It appears on the face of the presentments, that large sums of money have been voted to the protestant dissenting minister, and to other persons; for what purpose were those sums presented?—Those were the sums that used to go through my hands subsequently, first however, going to him, because the Act of Parliament directed that the inspector, or a grand juror should not have the management of the money, then when they could not get contracts, they used to present to a third individual, thereby bringing it to me that I might expend it.

You were the responsible individual?—I was.

Do you not think the Act of Parliament was defective in that respect?—I do, decidedly.

If any balance should remain in your hands, would not that balance appear upon the query book of the next term?—Certainly.

Is there any mode which you can suggest for the purpose of economizing?—Yes, I think there is.

Will you be so good as to suggest it?—I think if there was a power given of buying articles for the city of Dublin, under the grand jury cess, for ready money, it would save twenty per cent; I shall state my reason for that; with respect to one item, the article of clothes which are purchased at 19*s.* 6*d.* from the contractor, now I have purchased the same articles for ready money for 15*s.* 3*d.* of which I can show the documents to the Committee; it is to be recollected that the grand jury payments are from six to eight months credit.

Are you not aware that the 53d section of the 50th of Geo. the 3d. c. 103, authorizes the grand jury to make such presentments in advance to any person?—I am; and those presentments of public money are said to be in advance, though in point of fact, they are not in advance; for instance, at an Easter term if the grand jury presented to me as they formerly did a sum of 500*l.* that sum would be said to be raised in advance; that presentment has to go through all the forms; it

Rev.
J. R. *Gamble.*
(9 May.)

has to be fiated; it has to go to the parishes to be applotted by the vestries, and then it goes to collection; but the Committee will readily know that it is not easy to raise money under any tax; the way I have received that public money is by sums of from 100*l.* to 200*l.* and by the time I have received 200*l.* I have become indebted in the sum of 400*l.* to different persons.

So that you advanced the money?—Decidedly; I was more frequently in advance for the grand jury, than I have ever been in their debt; that fact is on the face of my books.

Would not the prisoners have been without food and without other necessaries, if you had not been responsible, by advancing your own money for those supplies?—Upon my word I should think they would, though I know if I applied to the court of King's Bench, they would have ordered food instantly.

Have the prisoners ever made any complaint of being left in that destitute situation?—Yes, they have; they have complained to me of getting bad provisions, which when sent away, they were for two or three hours without food, as the large quantum required could not be procured quickly.

Have they ever been left without food in consequence of the want of supplies?—No.

Do you mean to say, you have paid your own money on account of the gaols?—I mean that when I was in better circumstances I have done so.

Then the case might occur in which the prisoners would be in absolute want, if the inspector did not choose to advance the money?—Certainly, unless by advance of money, or personal responsibility, I think so; of course there would be redress by the court of King's Bench, if applied to.

How many prisons do you attend, and what are their relative situations?—I attend five prisons, there are three of them in one street, the fourth prison, the Smithfield penitentiary, is about an English mile from that street, and I think the Richmond bridewell is two English miles from that, indeed rather more.

Are you inspector of all those prisons?—Yes.

In virtue of your office, as curate of Saint Michan's?—The late Act of Parliament made the curate of Saint Michan's inspector of the prisons.

Will you state to the Committee your duties as inspector, in as full a manner as you can?—I am directed by the statute to attend all the prisons twice a week, and oftener, if necessary, to visit every apartment in each prison, to redress the grievances of all the prisoners, as far as is in my power; to oversee generally the providing of all articles, and to check generally the receipt of those articles.

Do you visit every cell?—Yes, every cell.

Do you make a return of the state of the prisons to the judges;—I do, every term, to each of the four judges and to the grand jury, and to the inspector general once a year, and a general annual return to Parliament through the inspector general. The inspectors general constantly visit the Dublin prisons themselves.

Is it not part of your duty to examine whether the rules and regulations of the prisoners are attended to?—It is.

Is not that rather a troublesome part of your duty?—It is very troublesome.

Those rules are very numerous and complicated in their nature?—They are.

That takes up a considerable portion of your time?—It does; that is my duty according to the statute.

Is it not your duty to insert in your reports whether those regulations have been observed?—It is.

You have the power also of reporting on the conduct of the gaolers and turnkeys and all the sub-officers of the prisons?—Yes.

Do those various duties take up a very considerable portion of your time?—They do, certainly.

Under whose immediate control are you placed as inspector?—First under the government, then the four judges of the King's Bench: there is also a controlling power in the four different grand juries; the four sessions grand juries, which are always sitting, assume a control, and the inspectors general have the final control.

Is it not part of your duty to attend to the contracts for the supply of prisoners?—I receive the article sent in in the gaol of Newgate only; I see the articles sent in in the other prisons, but I am not the person who keeps the stores in the other prisons.

Can you state how often the cells and other parts of the prison of Newgate are whitewashed?—I can state it correctly; one yard in succession is whitewashed every week, so that the prison is thoroughly whitewashed once in four or five weeks; parts of it are whitewashed every week; all the cells of the Richmond bridewell are whitewashed every morning.

Can you give the Committee any information as to the mode adopted by the grand jury for supplying the prisoners with provisions and other articles by contract?—The secretary of the grand jury advertises a month or three weeks previously to the sitting of each term.

Have you ever seen the advertisements in the paper?—Constantly.

Will you be so good as to put in one of those advertisements?

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

NOTICE:

The ensuing Michaelmas grand jury for the city of Dublin, will receive proposals for supplying the respective gaols of Newgate, Sheriff's prison and Richmond bridewell, on the Circular road, with the following articles, until the last day of Easter term next; viz. soap, candles, bread, potatoes, meal and ox heads; herrings, salt, new milk and buttermilk, blankets and rugs, linen, clothes for convicts, lamp oil, lighting Sheriff's prison, lime, sand and freestone, buckets, tubs and brooms, brushes, mops, tins, straw, best Whitehaven coals, glazing, sundry forms, tables, trenchers, hammocks, and also for sundry repairs and whitewashing to be executed in the gaols of Newgate and Sheriff's prison; particulars of which may be known by application to the Rev. Piers Gamble, St. Michan's vestry, or Mr. Henry A. Baker, Architect, N° 112, Mecklenburgh-street. Proposals to be sent (sealed) to Mr. Alexander Mongomery, 14 North Frederick-street, on or before Monday the 5th day of November next.

Is that notice which you have put in, a copy of the general notice which is published on every occasion, when the grand jury wish for a contract?—I think they seldom deviate from that notice.

Are such notices published before every term when contracts become necessary?—Before the two presenting terms in each year.

Have you ever known an instance when such a notice was omitted?—Not within my memory.

When the offers are sent in to the grand jury, to supply the prisoners by contract, is it within your knowledge to state whether the grand jury in any instances show a partiality in accepting those tenders?—I cannot state that I ever knew an instance of partiality being shown; the contracts come in sealed to the grand jury, and I believe their method of acting is, to appoint a particular day to open those contracts, when they open them and make a contract; all the other contracts are entered on the blotter of the grand jury, and finally transferred from that to the King's Bench book.

Can you state whether the court is in the habit of asking for the different contracts sent in to the grand jury?—I have seen them always handed up to the judge.

For what purpose is that?—For the purpose of seeing that it is properly carried on.

It is for the purpose of seeing that the lowest contract has been adopted by the grand jury?—I should think so.

When a contract has been made with any individual, or when any individual has supplied prisoners with articles by contract under you, is not that individual obliged to swear in open court to the justice of his charge?—A contract must be made with the grand jury, and then that individual must make, what is called an accounting affidavit, swearing that he has (I believe the words are) "fairly and honestly supplied the articles agreeably to this contract," before he gets his money.

And that takes place in open court?—In open court; he does not make the affidavit in open court, his affidavit is shown to the court.

Every tender that is made must come before the court?—Every tender that is made goes from the grand jury to the court.

How often are you obliged to visit the several prisons in the city of Dublin?—I am obliged by law to visit them all twice a week, and oftener if necessary; I visit Newgate, the sheriff's prison, and the city Marshalsea much oftener; Newgate four times at least in the week.

Could you by any collusion with the contractors, enhance the value of your own situation?—I think very little; in the first place, the sum which goes to contractors, is a small sum; I do not think it is above 1,500 *l.* half yearly, and the checks which are made on the contracts are very numerous; when the articles contracted for are sent

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

sent into any of the prisons, it is the duty of the gaoler of the prison to receive the article, and in my absence to compare it with the pattern; on such inspection by him, he makes a report to me of that fact in writing, and at the end of every six months, before the grand jury sits, there is a general report made, signed by the gaoler of each prison and by myself, of the quality of all the articles sent in during the preceding six months.

Then you think it is almost impossible, that any article which is sent in for the supply of the prisons could, without detection, vary from the pattern?—The inspection is so minute, that I do think it nearly impossible, for in the article of contracts, I have known a person not paid for his contract, because twenty pair of blankets were twelve ounces lighter than they should be.

Do you think it possible in the supply of the article of linen, that a sample would be exhibited in the prison, and that the articles supplied for the use of the prison could be of an inferior quality, without such inferiority being instantly detected?—I do not think it possible; I myself might be deceived in the article of linen, but there is a matron in each of the gaols, and I have made it the province of the matron generally to look at the articles, which she would be a better judge of than I am.

Have you made any calculations as to the amount and kind of contracts, and the number of contractors in each half year?—I think the amount in each half year is about 1,600*l.* that only goes to the supply of food and clothes and of blankets; it does not go to building and repairs.

As to the amount and kind of contracts, have you made any calculations as to their amount?—I stated the amount to be between fifteen and sixteen hundred pounds; the kind of contracts included in that are food, clothing and bedding; and I think the number of contractors is about thirteen or fourteen.

You include soap and coals?—Soap, coals and straw.

Oil?—Yes.

Brushes?—Yes.

Herrings?—Yes.

There are separate contracts for all those articles?—Generally, there are separate contracts for all those articles.

And the same check upon each contract?—Yes, the same check upon each contract; I could show the Committee some of the checks.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

May 1822.

"The several articles furnished to the prisons were of the following quality, for six months, ending Michaelmas 1822.

Articles.	REPORT.	Contractors.
Bread - -	Generally very good, indeed, once or twice of indifferent quality, but changed	Rickard.
Milk - - -	Very good at all the prisons - - - - -	Richardson. Glarmon. Dignum.
Potatoes - -	Very good when bought at market, but when served by contractor, generally had to be changed, and much trouble and inconvenience arose - - - - - - - -	Richardson.
Blankets - -	Good weight and size (agreeably to N° 2) at which price they are charged; those sent to bridewell, a few ounces light; they were but 20 pair at 12/9 and 17/6 per	Dalton.
Ticks - -	Very good - - - - - - - - - - -	Do.
Sheets - -	good - - - - - - - - - - -	Do.
Coals - -	Good and most satisfactorily served - - -	Hand.
Herrings - -	Good - - - - - - - - - - - -	Kelevy.
Oil - - -	Good - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Do.

Newgate {Piers Rt Gamble / Rt Gilbert} Richmond. {Thos Purdon} Smithfield. {J.E. Martin."

(*Witness*)

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

(Witness) That is the kind of report that I send in half yearly, and those are checks.

A good deal has been said respecting the supply of potatoes to the prisoners, at the rate of 6*l.* a ton; and it appears in the presentment sheet, that in Easter term 680*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* was the presentment for a supply of potatoes, and the mark in the presentment sheet for Michaelmas term in the same year, the supply of the same articles was 228*l.* 17*s.* 11*d.*; can you inform the Committee what is the reason of the difference between those two sums in the supply of those important articles?—Decidedly; that the contractor was not paid in the latter case.

Does not that difference arise entirely from the checks that have been adopted for preventing contractors from improperly serving their contracts?—Certainly.

Were not complaints made of the quality of the potatoes that were served at that rate?—There were.

Did you, as inspector, order the discontinuance of the supply by that contractor?—I did in one prison, in the Smithfield penitentiary.

State the whole transaction, so far as you were concerned as inspector?—When the grand jury advertised for potatoes, previous to Easter 1822, it was the time of the great distress, after the disturbances in the south, and there was a prospect then that potatoes would rise very much in Dublin; consequently no offer for contract was sent in to the grand jury: the grand jury, during their sitting, advertised a second time, and in consequence of their second advertisement two offers came in, both at 6*l.* a ton; the grand jury brought the two offers into court and submitted both or one of them to the sitting judge, stating at the same time, that they considered them very unreasonable; the judge gave it as his opinion that they could not avoid taking the contract, but stated that the money might be presented to the inspector, to buy the potatoes at market price, which I declined doing; the contract was entered into; the man sent in the very first instance bad potatoes to the gaol; I heard so from one of the officers, and I went to the gaol and found them so.

State the name of the contractor?—A man of the name of Patrick Richardson; I went to the gaol at Newgate, and found the report that they were bad potatoes to be true; I sent for the contractor, and informed him of it; he stated to me the difficulty of getting good potatoes at that time; I knew myself it was difficult; I told him, with respect to good potatoes, if they are not to be got, all I want is, that you will authorize some person to go to market to buy the best potatoes; he said, he would do so; he did not give good potatoes, and as no grand jury was sitting, I wrote a letter to the magistrates of the head office, requesting that they would direct potatoes to be purchased for the Richmond bridewell, at the market price, and likewise requesting that they would direct potatoes to be purchased for the Smithfield penitentiary, those two prisons being directly under the jurisdiction of the magistrates; they complied with my letter respecting Smithfield penitentiary, but respecting Richmond bridewell and Newgate, they told me they could not break the man's contract; I then applied to the secretary of the grand jury on the subject, and the secretary of the grand jury, in answer to my letter, sent me a copy of Mr. Richardson's contract, upon reading which I found a great deal of difficulty existed in breaking it, on my part; the man then went to market, and sent us in for the future, with very few exceptions, very good potatoes: I told him frequently, that I would not give him a certificate for his potatoes at 6*l.* a ton, which certificate I did refuse to give him, and the man in consequence has not been paid.

Is not that the reason of the difference between the sums of 620*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* and 228*l.* 17*s.* 11*d.* at the respective presenting terms?—I believe it to be so.

Has the money been paid since?—Not to my knowledge.

What cognizance have the court of King's Bench, of the manner in which the officers discharge their duty?—At the sitting of every grand jury, there is an attendance book laid before the grand jury, in which the name of each officer must be entered, his particular visit, and the duty performed at that visit; and I must make quarterly returns to the inspector-general of the prisons on that subject.

You exercise an official control over the officers in that respect?—I do.

Do you receive official reports from the physician and surgeon?—I do, every week.

Are you enabled to state that the grand jury carefully look to that department?—I have seen a great deal of care and attention on the part of the grand juries, with respect to the medical department.

Have you known the accounts of the apothecary to be strictly examined?—I have seen them examined in the court.

Rev.
P. R. Gamble.
(9 May.)

Have you, as inspector, known a very heavy pressure of business in the medical department?—I have, very heavy.

State the circumstances?—I think at one time fever was very prevalent, and I have known Dr. Harty to be obliged to be accompanied with other medical gentlemen of his own procuring; I have seen a very bad fever in the gaol, and I have known other cases in which Dr. Harty has brought in other physicians.

Can you state whether any abuses exist with respect to insolvents under the grand jury cess, and if so, what returns are made by the grand jury?—With respect to insolvencies, I have heard of abuses; but the returns that are made ought to be a sufficient check on the abuses; the check on the abuses of the insolvencies lies with the parishioners of each parish, besides the grand juries, because the returns go directly to the vestries.

Have you ever known any instance of misconduct on the part of the collectors, in appropriating the amount levied to their own purposes, and returning the houses as insolvent?—No; I have known a collector to be dismissed, but I have not known the reason of his dismissal.

Is the applotment according to the rate of ministers money made triennially according to law?—I believe it is.

Has any information been required of you respecting the prisons of Dublin, by the parish committee?—Yes; they did write to me on the subject, and I sent them an answer the next day.

Did you hesitate to give them every information possible respecting the management of the prisons, under your inspection?—Never; I gave them every information they required.

Who is the gaoler of Newgate?—Frederick George Bourne.

What salary does he receive?—400*l.* a year.

Has he any other allowance?—He has fees on prisoners acquitted or convicted, (by Act of Parliament,) the amount of which is about 250*l.*

Has his allowance lately been altered in any way, either increased or diminished?—It has been much diminished.

When was his salary of 400*l.* a year appointed?—About twelve years ago, before his appointment.

How does the appoinment of the gaoler take place, and by whom is he appointed?—By the corporation of the city of Dublin.

Under whose control is he?—Under the court of King's Bench, and the grand jury, and the inspectors' general; he is not removeable by the court of King's Bench for misconduct, like the other officers.

Do you know what situation Mr. Bourne was formerly in?—He was an officer in the army.

Do you know whether he is any and what relation of Alderman Archer's?—I have heard, that he is related by marriage distantly, that his wife is some relation of Alderman Archer's first wife.

Is he brother-in-law to Alderman Archer?—No, he is not; I think, I have heard, but I do not know precisely the connection.

You know he is not brother-in-law?—I should think decidedly not, I should know if he was; I shall ascertain his connection as accurately as I can by to-morrow.

What security does the gaoler give?—I think the gaoler gives 5,000*l.* security; but I cannot say exactly.

Is there any law to enable the grand jury or any other body, to superannuate their officers?—No, there is not; and in consequence, our salaries are much reduced by being obliged to insure our lives; the gaoler pays 100*l.* per year insurance.

Who is the deputy gaoler?—Robert Gilbert.

How is he appointed?—The appointment by law, belongs to the gaoler; but he has always waived it.

Who makes the appointment?—He makes the appointment literally, but he writes to the magistrates to recommend a deputy gaoler to him, and then he is always appointed on their recommendation.

What is his duty?—His duty is to attend the gaol of Newgate whenever the gaoler is absent, and to have the custody of all the prisoners, equally as responsible to the public as the gaoler is.

What salary has he?—He has 200*l.* a year.

Had he always that?—No; his salary was raised last year from 150*l.* to 200*l.*

in

in consequence of the loss of fees to him, and in consequence of the sheriff of Antrim gaol, offering him a situation in Antrim gaol worth 400 *l.* a year; which he declined for the purpose of staying in Dublin.

Does he enter into security?—He does; in the sum of 1,000 *l.* to the gaoler.

Do you know what salary the gaoler of Newgate in London has?—800 *l.* a year.

Does that include all the fees and emoluments of the keeper of Newgate here?—I believe so; I believe it is a fixed salary.

Do you know how it is, that by the return to Parliament, the gaoler's fees appear greater than they are?—At that time, the gaoler of Newgate had the rents of rooms, and fees on traversers, and fees on prisoners discharged; those have all been cut off by law.

Do you know how many assistants the gaoler of Newgate in London has?—Fourteen.

What number of assistants are there in the Dublin gaol?—Five now, directly under the gaoler, and two in the hospitals; one lately dead, whose situation is not filled up.

Are there not nurses in the hospitals?—There is a hospital keeper in each hospital.

What number of prisoners can the gaol of Newgate in Dublin contain?—It does contain 300, but it ought not to contain more than about 140.

Do you mean males and females both?—Yes; I mean all classes of prisoners.

Is there any classification of prisoners in Newgate?—There is; but not the classification that is desirable; there is a classification between males and females, and there is a classification among the males of four classes; but among the females none.

Do you conceive it possible, in the present gaol of Newgate, to carry the provisions of the Gaol Act into full effect?—It is quite impossible; the inspectors general have effected much in the way of classification.

What is the daily average of committals for the last three months in Newgate?—I should say eight every day.

Does not the law direct, that the convicts should be removed when under sentence?—The late Act of Parliament does.

Is that done?—It is not provided for yet, it directs the Lord Lieutenant to do so; it is under consideration; the Act passed only last session.

In consequence of such non-observance of the existing law, is there not a very considerable charge imposed on the public, as well as great inconvenience to the officers of the prison?—Yes.

Are you acquainted with the penitentiary of Grange Gorman-lane?—I have visited it.

At the time you visited it, was not a considerable portion of it unoccupied?—Yes.

Do you not conceive the transmission of the convicts from the Dublin prison to Grange Gorman-lane, would have the effect of carrying the existing law into effect, and relieving the prison of Dublin from very great inconvenience?—I do decidedly; and I am clearly of opinion, that transportation directly after sentence, would tend much to lessen crime.

Are the convicts clothed?—They are.

How often?—They are now clothed while in prison, and they are always clothed when going away.

At whose expense is that clothing?—The last time they were clothed, it was at the expense of government.

Are they always clothed on going away, whether they want it or not?—They are always clothed on going away; I have received a reprimand, for letting a citizen, a convict, go down in his own clothes.

It has been stated, that the making of clothes out of old blankets, is productive of expense, and obliges the grand jury to order new ones in large quantities?—I should think it was productive of no expense at all, because the blankets of which the clothes are made are completely useless, as blankets, in point of cover at night; the expense of making those clothes, is not more than two and sixpence a suit, and exclusive of that, it gives a portion of labour to one of the penitentiaries, which is very much wanted; the quantity of blankets used is not so extraordinary as would appear, when I state one fact, that the blankets used in two years amounted to 243 pair, and the number of persons admitted, and of course accommodated during that time, amounted to 3,649.

It has been stated, that in Michaelmas 1819, the charge for blankets exceeded

a thousand

Rev.
P. R. Gamble.
(9 May)

a thousand pounds for the half year?—I have been making inquiry into that circumstance, and I cannot ascertain that such is the fact; I recollect that Richmond bridewell was furnished in that year, so that I rather think that statement has been made, with reference to other articles as well as blankets, because there was the furnishing of a new prison, (the largest prison in Dublin) in toto in one year.

Is there any better description of clothing given to the prisoners?—Yes, to the convicts under the letter, that I showed the Committee from government.

At whose expense is that clothing provided?—It was always at the city's expense until now.

Does that expense cease now entirely?—It does by the effect of the last prison Act.

It falls upon government now?—It does.

Are the clothes, when received, compared with the patterns?—They are uniformly compared.

Are all other articles also compared with the patterns?—They are; I have put in a document to that effect.

What does the convicts clothing consist of?—Jacket, waistcoat, trowsers, and two shirts, two pair of stockings and pair of shoes, a cap, handkerchief, and small bag.

When the articles are not equal to the pattern contracted for, what is the consequence?—They are sent back; either sent back or not paid for.

Why should the clothing in Newgate be better than the clothing at bridewell?—The clothing at Newgate is for the convicts alone; it is only from Newgate that convicts go; the clothing for bridewell would answer of an inferior quality for a very obvious reason, that the bridewell is a prison where there is no ingress and egress, no person is allowed to visit prisoners, on any account, except as a reward for good behaviour; the prisoners at bridewell are employed also; the prisoners at Newgate have no means of employment; and there is so much egress and ingress in consequence of the visitors going to see prisoners not tried, that the same kind of clothes would not last.

By whom are the convicts clothed?—The letter from government comes to the sheriff, and he hands the letter to me, which is a direction to me to provide the clothes for the convicts out of the stock the grand jury have laid in.

Who was your last contractor?—I think his name was Christopher Graham.

It would seem, that people that are in constant employment, would require a stronger description of clothing than people that only receive visits?—That would have some reference to the mode of occupation; but the occupation in Richmond bridewell, being weaving and shoemaking only, does not require a strong suit of clothing; the clothing provided is found to last very well; I am aware, from experience, that there never existed a complaint in the gaol of Newgate of want of clothing, nor that the prisoners ever were in a state of nudity until the Act for clothing them passed.

When did that Act pass?—I think in the 50th of the late King, that enables the prisoners to get a certain quantity of clothes, but it was not acted on; the prisoners did not then know their rights.

When did they first know their rights?—I could not state the exact time; but I could state a circumstance which would bring it to my recollection; the committee of a sessions grand jury, visited the gaol of Newgate, and found some of the prisoners in a state of nakedness; those gentlemen spoke to the prisoners, and told them that they were entitled to clothes.

When was that?—I think about four years ago.

Do you think that it was that visit which called the attention of the prisoners to the powers that were vested in the grand jury to give them clothing?—I do recollect that circumstance so strongly; but I do think that was the first general introduction of clothing into Newgate, except in the case of transports.

Then you do not conceive, that prior to that, they were aware that they had a right to claim clothing from the public?—I do not think that the prisoners knew it prior to that time.

You have stated, that you conceive it was the knowledge of that fact which has produced the state of nudity so much complained of; how do you account for there being prisoners in a state of nudity, prior to that circumstance being known?—I reconcile it in this way, that the prisoners have in general appeared in a state of nudity, when strangers go into the prison.

Do you conceive, from your knowledge of the class of persons who are at present committed

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

committed to Newgate, that if some effort was not made on the part of the public to provide them with clothing, that they could provide themselves with clothing?—I only speak from a general knowledge of the circumstance of the prisoners of the city of Dublin always going out of the gaol well clad, and I do not think I could recollect more than two or three instances of the contrary being the case.

Are the prisoners committed to the gaol of Newgate, in many instances, of the lowest and poorest part of the community?—There are a great many of the prisoners committed who are of the poorest and lowest class.

How do you account for prisoners of that description being able to provide themselves with clothing?—I will tell the Committee exactly my opinion; I think the parish of St. Michan furnishes to the gaol of Newgate two-thirds of the city committals; in that parish there is a place known by the name of Mary's lane, which is notorious for being the depôt of the Dublin thieves, and likewise notorious for the purchase of all stolen articles of clothes; under these circumstances I do conclude that the prisoners who go from St. Michan's parish into Newgate are able, being related to those persons, to furnish themselves with clothes in all instances.

You have known cases in which prisoners have continued in Newgate for a very considerable length of time?—I have.

Is there any such provision made as to allow the employment of prisoners during the time of their imprisonment, so as to admit of their earning clothing for themselves?—Not in the gaol of Newgate, except among the females.

In those cases of long imprisonment, unless the public interfered and gave some assistance in the way of clothing, how could the prisoners alluded to, be supplied with clothing towards the close of their long imprisonment?—I have known many instances of persons confined for long periods having good clothes, and I have known a few instances of long confinement in which it was necessary to give them clothing.

You have known instances in which it has been necessary to give them clothing in cases of long confinement?—I have known some instances.

But very few in Dublin?—Very few.

Who is Mr. Graham the contractor for clothing?—He is a merchant on the quay.

Has he ever served upon grand juries?—I declare I cannot answer that question decidedly.

Is he a common-councilman?—I believe he is a corporation man lately.

What is the expense of the contract?—19*s.* 6*d.*

Do you know the expense of the former contract?—The expense of the former contract I think was 22*s.*

Who was the former contractor?—Robert Dalton.

Can you account for the difference of the price?—Yes, I can; the fall of cloth was the cause of the difference; I was told so, and I went to a merchant in Dublin, a wholesale clothier.

Who?—Mr. Redman's in Bridge-street.

Do you know Mr. Dalton's situation in life?—Yes I do, I know he has a connection in a woollen warehouse in Parliament-street.

Do you know whether he has been in the employment of Alderman Nugent?—I do, he had been shopman to Alderman Nugent for twenty years.

How long has that connection ceased?—About two years.

You do not conceive there is any connection between him and Alderman Nugent at the present moment?—If any credit is to be given to a gentleman's word, I can positively say no, for Aldermen Nugent directly assured me that there was no connection.

Can you state the date of the earliest contract that you know Dalton had?—Not from my memory.

Are you aware he had contracts prior to Easter 1822?—I believe he had.

Had he in the year 1821?—I think he had.

Do you conceive he had a contract in any part of the year 1820?—I do not think he had, but I cannot say positively.

Or in any prior year?—I think not; I cannot say decidedly.

Then according to the best of your recollection, Michaelmas 1820 was the first contract?—To the best of my recollection.

At that time do you conceive he was shopman to Alderman Nugent?—I will tell the Committee how the circumstance was; Alderman Nugent was leaving off business and closing his accounts; and he did leave off business directly after Michaelmas 1821.

At

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

At the presenting term of 1821, Mr. Dalton had a contract?—He had.

And you conceive, at that time, his connection with Alderman Nugent had not ceased?—He certainly was doing business for Alderman Nugent at that time.

Have you any document which you can refer to, to state the name of the Grand Jury in Michaelmas 1821?—No, I have not, but I dare say, from my memory, I could tell if there was any particular person on it.

Do you remember whether Alderman Nugent was on that grand jury?—Without being positive, I should think he was.

Subject to the correction of official documents, you think he was?—I do.

What does the dietary of Newgate consist of?—The present dietary of Newgate consists of two pounds of bread per diem and a quart of new milk.

Do you give them potatoes?—No.

Do you conceive that bread and milk is the dietary which is most economical to the public, and most advantageous to the internal discipline of the prison?—I do not conceive it is the dietary most economical to the public, but I think it is the dietary most conducive to the internal discipline of the prison.

Will you state your reason?—The gaol of Newgate is so confined that we could not cook food conveniently.

If you had a public kitchen, and if rations were delivered out cooked, do not you conceive, that the internal discipline of the prison would be much better secured, and considerable economy at the same time obtained?—I do.

The prisoners, themselves, are not partial to the use of bread?—No, they are not.

Does it not sometimes happen, that they are anxious to exchange bread for any other articles of food?—I believe they would be anxious to do so; but I can state decidedly, that no such commutation now takes place.

You are clear upon that?—I am decided upon that point.

That there is no commutation for potatoes or whiskey?—None.

Is there any introduction of spirits into the prison?—Indeed, I think not. The only two instances that were detected lately, were both sent to the police office under the new Act of Parliament, which is a very judicious one.

Is there any introduction of fermented liquors, not spirituous, into the prison?—Every person, of the better kind, is allowed to get porter. If a gentleman was in for an assault, he would be allowed to get porter for his dinner, and wine if he required.

Whether convicted or unconvicted?—Yes, whether convicted or unconvicted.

So that that rule, with regard to fermented liquors, is regulated by his station in life?—Decidedly.

Are you aware of any provision of the law with regard to that?—I am not.

Do the great proportion of the prisoners in Newgate, receive support in food from the public?—The great proportion do, certainly.

Do any part of the prisoners, who so receive support at the public expense, receive any support from their friends out of doors, or from any other source?—I am afraid it is the case in some instances. I know instances in which it is rather winked at.

You are aware that the provisions of the law, upon that subject, are contrary to such a practice?—I am perfectly aware of it, it is a provision of the last session.

Therefore, in those instances, the provisions of the law are not enforced?—Not rigidly enforced.

You are aware, that in cases where the health of the party requires it, there is a special provision in the Act which authorizes an exception from the general rule?—I do not mean under that exception.

To whom is the option left of dispensing with the direct provisions of the law?—In general cases to me; and if I saw reasonable cause, I would authorize the gaoler to allow a prisoner a certain quantity of provision, stating the quantity, or stating the article.

Is that discretion ever exercised by any other individual except by one in your situation in life?—The physician may exercise that discretion.

Is it ever exercised by any inferior officer in the prison?—I have known it exercised by one of the turnkeys, for which he received a very severe reprimand, and was fined.

Do not you conceive, that if once prisoners are allowed to receive supplies from without, that it becomes extremely difficult, if not impossible, to regulate the description of supplies they receive, and to exclude, altogether, either fermented

or

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(9 May.)

or spirituous liquors, in case it should be judged advisable to do so?—I should give my decided approbation to a clause, compelling all prisoners to take the gaol allowance.

Is not that clause in the prison law?—I have received an opinion from authority, that it was not.

Supposing a case of a prisoner receiving the gaol allowance, do you imagine that there is a power vested in any authority, to allow that prisoner to receive supplies from his friends, in addition to the gaol allowance?—No; I do not think any officer would be borne out, under the Act of Parliament, in allowing it; but I have known cases which called for interference.

Have you ever known any criminals removed to the debtors side?—I have; we call it the State side, what was originally called the Debtor side; by the late provisions of the Act of Parliament there are no debtors allowed.

But before the late alteration, have you ever known any criminals removed to the debtor side?—I have.

In more cases than one?—I have.

Was there any fee or emolument, or rent, charged upon criminals so removed to a better apartment?—I do believe they paid a rent for a better apartment.

To whom?—To the gaoler.

Do you consider such practice to be according to law?—No, I do not consider that practice to be according to law; but that the gaoler had a right to demand a rent for a room previous to the Act of last session.

Do you consider, that, according to the 50th of George the Third, he had any right to remove a criminal to the debtor side of the prison?—No.

Then you conceive it to be contrary to law?—I do.

Did you, in your official capacity, ever make any remonstrance on the subject?—I did.

To whom?—To the gaoler, the deputy gaoler, and the clerk.

In consequence of the remonstrances which you so properly made, was the practice discontinued; did it cease?—Indeed I think there were five instances of the case that I have mentioned; but I rather think it required repeated remonstrances to stop it.

Did it altogether cease up to the moment of the late alterations by government authority?—The Act of Parliament was enforced by a counter order from the court of King's Bench; and from that moment it ceased in toto.

When was that?—I should think that was about three months ago.

Up to three months ago, it continued?—It did.

How long has your official connection with the prisons of Dublin lasted?—From the year 1814.

When did this practice, of allowing criminals to be placed among debtors, according to your best recollection, begin?—I am not cognizant of prisoners being removed from the felon side to the state side in many instances; but I am aware that prisoners coming in and going to the state side, were obliged to pay a rent.

By the state side, you describe the debtor side?—Yes.

You stated there was a difference between Newgate and other gaols, that you had not the same control in Newgate over the contractor; if the potatoes furnished in Newgate were of bad quality, you could not compel the contractor to change them, for what reason is that?—Because the other prisons are more directly under the magistrates of the head office; and though they have not the grand jury money in their hands, they have no objection to buy potatoes out of the funds in their hands, and wait till the grand jury re-presented it. With respect to the gaol of Newgate, such is not the case; they have not the same power.

You are then obliged to take bad provisions in Newgate from the contractors?—No; they are not taken in any instance.

Who is the apothecary of the prison?—Messrs. Craven and Nichols.

Who performs the duty?—Both in turn; and sometimes, when bleeding is necessary, or a minor operation, persons of their establishment.

Are the duties performed by them to your satisfaction?—I have never heard a complaint.

You consider them to be good officers, administering their functions under the existing law?—I consider them to be good officers, and most respectable men.

Do they discharge the duties of apothecary according to law?—Decidedly so.

Do they attend the physician in his visits?—Not always.

Rev. P. R. Gamble. (9 May.)

Do they most frequently attend him in his visits; is their attendance the rule, or is it the exception?—They were required to do so by the order of the grand jury; and I believe that the physician interfered, and said that the requiring the apothecary to attend him in his visits would be rather a nuisance than otherwise.

Are you aware of the law which directs the apothecary to attend the physician in his visits?—I am.

So far as that enactment goes, the apothecary, in not attending the physician in his visits, does not comply with the law?—He does not.

Are you acquainted with the surgeon of the prison?—I am.

By the attendance book, directed to be kept by the last Act, you know what attendance the surgeon has given?—I do; he has been ill for some time; he has been ill for two months, and confined to bed.

During his illness who attends for him?—Surgeon Taggart.

Have you brought the attendance book with you?—I have not; but I have brought an extract from it.

[*The witness delivered in the same.*]

How often in a week does the surgeon attend?—I should consider him as attending twice a week, and oftener, if required.

Does he regularly attend at those times?—Surgeon Read has been lately appointed, and it has not come to me to make an official return of his attendance as one of the officers, but I believe he regularly attended till his illness.

Did surgeon Read's predecessor attend regularly twice a week?—Surgeon Read's predecessor laboured under an infirmity, which rendered him incapable of attending for a year and a half before he resigned.

Who attended for him?—Surgeon Stokes.

Did either the surgeon, or his deputy, attend twice a week regularly?—Surgeon Stokes did, most regularly.

Are you acquainted with the number of surgical cases which rendered his attendance necessary; were there many?—The surgeon and the physician make regular weekly reports to me of all the prisoners under their care, and of the prisons. Here are some returns, which I will produce to the Committee.

[*The witness delivered in the same.*]

How is the whitewashing of the prisons carried on?—The whitewashing of Newgate and Smithfield penitentiary, and the bridewell, is done by the prisoners. The whitewashing of the City Marshalsea is sometimes done by the prisoners of Newgate.

Is there any charge made for that?—No; I believe it rather goes under the head of Newgate. The City Marshalsea has been whitewashed, and charged for; in some half years there is a charge made for whitewashing that and the sheriff's prison, which is a debtor's prison.

Do you conceive, that the present constitution of the grand juries, composed exclusively of the members of the corporation, offers any difficulty to a fair and open competition in the way of contract?—I conceive that it does not offer any difficulty to the fair competition of contract, because I know that the grand juries have exercised a most judicious choice in selecting those contracts.

Are you aware, whether many of the contractors are, in point of fact, connections of the grand jurors themselves?—I am not aware as to the number.

You do not know whether they are or are not?—No; I have heard that some are.

Do you think, that if a contract were to be advertised for by the county of Dublin grand jury, and a similar contract to be advertised for by the city of Dublin grand jury, that there would be likely to be as open competition for the city contract as for the county contract?—I should think so.

Who is the Roman Catholic chaplain of Newgate?—The Reverend Lawrence Morrissy.

Does he discharge his duty as chaplain in the prison?—He does discharge all the duties that the law points out, and is very punctual in his attendance.

What are they?—He attends at the distribution of provisions, constantly, and he attends to exhort the prisoners on each Sunday.

When he administers his sacred functions, do the prisoners attend?—In some prisons they do, in others they do not.

Rev. P. R. Gamble. (9 May.)

In which prisons do they not?—They do not in the sheriff's prison. I do not think they attend so well in Newgate as they do in Richmond bridewell, and Smithfield penitentiary.

Are you aware why they do not?—I have heard a reason assigned.

What have you heard?—I have heard, that Mr. Morrissy has been interdicted from the performance of his sacred functions by the Roman Catholic bishop.

In point of fact, are there many cases in which the prisoners express a disinclination, to attend Mr. Morrissy on that account?—Many cases.

Are you aware of any statement having been made to the grand juries on this subject?—I have heard, that remonstrances were made to the grand juries, to the court of King's Bench, and to the chief secretary of state.

Is Mr. Morrissy the Roman Catholic curate of the parish in which the prison is situated?—He is not.

Who is the curate of the parish?—There are several Roman Catholic curates in that parish.

Are you aware, that by the provisions of the statute law of the country, the grand jury are bound to appoint the Roman Catholic curate of the parish in which the prisons are situated?—I am.

Then there is a departure from the law, with regard to the appointment of the the Roman Catholic chaplain?—Mr. Morrissy was in office prior to that law.

But the appointment of Mr. Morrissy, and his continuance in office, have involved the consequence, that many of the Roman Catholic prisoners are left without religious aid, so far as the establishment is concerned?—So far as the establishment is concerned, that is the case; but we have a decided order, not to prevent any prisoner from having communication with any clergyman that he may think proper.

The great proportion of prisoners in the gaol of Newgate are of the Roman Catholic persuasion?—I believe so.

The continuance of Mr. Morrissy in office, therefore, as far as the establishment is concerned, deprives many of the prisoners of religious aid?—Decidedly it does; but it is their own act, Mr. Morrissy having been interdicted for no immoral or improper act; and I have Mr. Morrissy's authority to say, that all prisoners would attend him, but for external interference.

Who is the Presbyterian clergyman of the prison?—Mr. James Horner.

Have you known, during your experience of the prisons, any considerable number of prisoners of that religious persuasion?—No, I have not.

Have you known any?—Yes, I have.

How many do you suppose?—I think I have known five or six in Newgate, at one time.

Are there any at the present moment?—I think, before I left home, there were two.

Do you think, that the services of that officer might or might not be dispensed with?—I think the services of that officer might be dispensed with, so far as regards his religious duties; but I wish to impress on the Committee, that Mr. Horner received his appointment as a recompence for doing the duty for twenty years gratuitously. There are, however, other duties attached to his situation.

Have you any observations to make to the Committee, with regard to the state of the City Marshalsea?—It is in much better order now than formerly, from an accident; the very accident that injured it has produced a great change for the better. A late storm blew down a stack of chimneys, and the late Act authorizes the magistrates to rebuild it, which has occasioned an improvement; but the other part of the prison still remains in the same state.

Under whose directions is it exclusively?—Under that of the corporation.

Have you an account of the annual expense of dieting the prisoners in the gaol of the city of Dublin, and also of the dieting of the prisons?—I have.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

Rev. *P. R. Gamble.*

(9 May.)

AMOUNT of Annual Expense of Dieting each Prisoner, in Dublin City; distinguishing the Prisons.

	Per Day each.	Per Year each.			Prisoners.			
		£.	*s.*	*d.*		£.	*s.*	*d.*
Richmond Bridewell -	3 ½	6	1	8	300	1,825	–	–
Smithfield Penitentiary	3 ½	6	1	8	150	912	10	–
Newgate - - - -	4 ½	7	12	1	300	2,181	5	–
Sheriff's Prison - -	4 ½	7	12	1	10	76	–	10
City Marshalsea - -	4 ½	7	12	1	20	152	1	8
780 Prisoners fed at an annual expense of - - £.						5,146	17	6

Expense of Clothes.

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
Richmond Bridewell:			
Each suit of Men's, 10*s.* - - - 150 prisoners - - -	75	–	–
Each suit, Female, 6*s.* - - - 150 d° - - - -	45	–	–
	£. 120	–	–
Smithfield Penitentiary:			
Boys suit - - - 8*s.* - - - 120 d° - - - -	48	–	–
Newgate:			
Men's suit of blanket clothes, 5*s.* - - - 50 prisoners -	12	10	–
Convicts* - - - - 150 a' 19*s.* 6*d.* - - - - - -	146	5	–
60 a' 22*s.* 0*d.* - - - - - -	66	–	–
TOTAL for one year - - - - -	£. 392	15	–

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
780 Prisoners fed - - - - - - -	5,146	17	6
680 D° clothed - - - - - -	392	15	–
TOTAL for one year - - -	£. 5,539	12	6

Dietary, Richmond Bridewell.

	Breakfast.	Dinner.
Sunday:	Two ounces oatmeal boiled into one quart porridge and one noggin new milk, and half a pound of bread - - -	Half a pound beef, one quart broth, 2½ lbs. potatoes, for all prisoners under 16 years old, and 3 lbs. for adults.
Monday:	Seven ounces oatmeal boiled into one quart stirabout and one pint butter milk - - - -	Seven ox heads boiled into broth, one quart each prisoner, and 3 lb. potatoes.
Tuesday	- - - d° - - d° - -	12 Ox heads - - d° - - d°.
Wednesday	- - d° - - d° - -	1 Herring and 3 lbs. potatoes each.
Thursday	- - - d° - - d° - -	12 Ox heads, in broth, one quart, and same allowance as Sunday.
Friday	- - - - d° - - d° - -	1 Herring and 3 lbs. potatoes each.
Saturday	- - - d° - - d° - -	Same as Thursday.

Smithfield:—Same as Richmond Bridewell as to expense.

Newgate: — Each prisoner gets 2 lb. bread and one quart milk each day, same as at debtor's prisons.

---

* This expense for the future will be paid by the government.

Lunæ, 12° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

The *Rev. Piers Robert Gamble,* again called in; and Examined.

Rev. P. R. Gamble. (12 May.)

DO you know how the Richmond bridewell was built?—I do; it was built by the order of government, under the government architect; government advanced the money to the grand jury, not in the literal sense advanced it, but when there was 5,000 *l.* worth of the building done, they paid 5,000 *l.* on account.

Had the grand jury any control over it?—They had nothing whatever to say to the building of it, I believe.

It appears that for the building of it there were three aldermen appointed as commissioners, that were in the building line, Aldermen Darley, Read and Thorpe; had they any interest whatever in being appointed commissioners to it, could they execute any part of the contract in consequence?—I believe they had no interest whatever in it; I was not inspector at that time, but I do not think they could have had any interest in it, because the money was only paid on certified bills going in to government, and paid by order of government out of the treasury; the plans were adopted by government, and the architect was the government architect; this is my knowledge of the case.

Who made the contracts; was it government or the grand jury?—The grand jury had nothing to say to them, it was the commissioners I believe; what has given the idea of the grand jury having any thing to say to it is, that the commissioners were sometimes on the grand juries, but the grand jury had nothing to do with it but to pay a certain sum to reimburse government for the building of the bridewell.

There has been a statement made to this Committee that in a contract taken by Mr. Mallett of Dublin for iron work for the gaol, Alderman Archer was reported to be a partner with him, who was a member of the grand jury at that time; can you state whether he was or was not?—I have Alderman Archer's direct authority to contradict it in every sense of the word, and I do not think it could have happened without my hearing of it before; and I never did hear of it, nor do I give the leas tcredit to it.

Do you know whether Mr. Archer had any connection with Mallett?—I do not believe he had any whatever.

Do you know any thing of the connection between Alderman Darley and Mr. O'Brien, or whether there is any partnership between them?—I believe there is none; I heard Alderman Darley say three years ago that he was giving up his business at that time in consequence of the increase in his official duty.

It has been stated to this Committee, that a widow of the name of Welsh, on the City quay, has been required to pay the grand jury cess, though she had a receipt from the collector; do you know what that transaction was?—I do; Widow Welsh has two houses on the City quay, for one of which she had paid cess for and produced a receipt, and she was not called upon to repay that, but she was called on to pay cess for the other house, for which she had not a receipt.

Were both the demands made by the same man?—No; one was made by a collector who was a defaulter, and the other was made by a subsequent collector, and she appealed to the grand jury relative to the cess that she had paid, and she was not required to pay that again, having produced the receipt; but she was called upon to pay the cess for the house for which she had not a receipt.

It has been stated to the Committee, that it was for the defaulting collector that she was re-assessed, can you say positively that she was not?—Mrs. Welsh had two houses, for one of which she could not produce the tax receipts, and therefore she was required to pay for that house.

You inspect Richmond bridewell?—I do.

Who is the governor of Richmond bridewell?—Thomas Purdon.

What is his emolument?—His salary is 400 *l.* a year, and he has a house, coals and candles, and vegetables.

No other emolument?—None other.

Who appoints to the situation?—The Act of Parliament gives the appointment to the lord lieutenant, but in this case, the government gave it to the grand jury.

What number of prisoners does the Richmond bridewell contain?—I think the average is 300.

Are they employed?—They are.

How are they employed?—I have here a daily return which shows how they are all employed.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(12 May.)

Richmond Bridewell Report, for Wednesday the 26th day of March 1823.

	Male.	Female.	Males.	Females.	Total.
In health			145	105	250
Physician's patients			6	11	17
Surgeon's d°			4	4	8
Number in confinement in the morning			155	120	275
Committed this day	—	—			
Liberated d°	1	1	1	1	2
Number in confinement in the evening			154	119	273
Employed as follows:					
Spinning worsted yarn			—	50	
Reeling yarn			—	2	
Winding d°			22	8	
Weaving sacking			—	—	
— blankets and rugs			—	—	
— Linen			—	—	
— Flannel			1	—	
— Corduroy			52	6	
Making weaver's dressing			1	—	
Tailoring			7	—	
Shoe making			6	—	
Chipping logwood			—	—	
Pounding freestone			—	—	
Lace making			—	—	
Knitting			—	1	
Sewing			—	8	
Hair cutting and shaving			1	—	
Gardening and labouring			20	—	
Door keepers and ward cleaners			9	8	
Monitors			3	—	
Laundry			—	5	
Cooking			5	—	
Scouring, cleaning, &c.			9	8	
White washing			3	—	
Sweeping			1	2	
Pumping water			—	4	
Painting and glazing			1	—	
Learning to weave			3	—	
Total employed			144	102	246
At school			—	—	
Reception ward			—	—	
In solitary confinement			—	—	
In hospital			10	15	
In convalescent ward			—	2	
Numbers above stated			154	119	

Thos Purdon, Governor.

Thomas Purdon, Governor. Archd Wilson, Deputy-governor.
Margt Frew, Matron.

Male Officers.	Female Officers.	Servants.
P. Brophy.	Ann Warren.	Thos Keef.
Jn° Macfarland.	Ann Kinslea.	Thos Coogan.
Geo. M'Gowan.	A. Kinslea.	
Francis Goldir.	S. Saunders.	Guard.
Robt Ferguson.	E. Nelson.	1 Serjeant,
Andw Carthy.		Corporal, and
J. Hamilton.		12 Privates.
Tho' Manning.		

Rev. *P. R. Gamble.*

(12 May.)

Do the prisoners get any proportion of the produce of their labour?—They do.

What proprotion do they get?—They have got one half, till lately, but a late Act of Parliament reduced it to one third.

Can you state what that amounted to, during any given time?—I can; I can state what the profit on the works was during any given time; the net profits on the works of Richmond bridewell, from the 3d of December 1821, till the 27th of March 1823, were 364*l.* 5*s.* 3½*d.*

What do you mean by the net profit?—The sum delivered in after paying the prisoners for their labour, and all expenses deducted.

Does not that sum go towards the maintenance of the prisoners?—It does.

What is the name of the deputy governor?—Archibald Wilson.

How is he appointed, and what is his salary?—He was appointed by the magistrates of the head office; his salary was 100*l.* a year, and was raised by order of the court of King's Bench to 150*l.*

Mention the names of the matron, the schoolmaster, and the other assistants, and their different salaries?—The matron, is Margaret Frew, her salary is 80*l.* a year; the clerk, is Patrick Brophy, his salary is 52*l.* a year; the schoolmaster, is James M^c Gowan, his salary is 20*l.* a year; there are six assistants, at 52*l.* a year each.

Do not you inspect Smithfield penitentiary?—I do.

What is the name of the governor, and what is his salary, and by whom appointed?—His name is John Marston, and he is appointed by the magistrates of the head office, on account of his services in that bridewell, when it belonged to government,

Do you know whether he is related to any member of the corporation?—He is not.

Who recommended Mr. Marston?—Indeed I do not think he was recommended, he required no recommendation; I think he was appointed solely because he had been governor under the government, and when the government gave up that prison, the magistrates re-appointed him.

What number of prisoners does the Smithfield penitentiary contain?—I think, the average is one hundred and fifty.

Is there any classification?—A decided classification between the boys and females, and a decided classification between the boys, during the day time, but there is only the same yard for them all to play in.

Are they engaged in any labour?—They are continually employed.

Do they get any portion of the profits?—Yes, they get one-fourth.

Is there any school established?—There is.

How many assistants are there in the prison?—Including three servants belonging to the master and mistress, and one servant for the house, there are eight.

Do you mean eight assistants in teaching?—No, eight in all.

Who is the protestant chaplain?—The Rev. Thomas Gamble.

He is your father, is he not?—He is.

How long has he been chaplain to the prisons of Dublin?—Forty years.

Is his duty more or less now, than when he was originally appointed?—It is much more, it is increased in a greater proportion than that of the other officers, for he had only the gaol of Newgate when he was appointed, and he has now the sheriff's prison, the gaol of Newgate, and the two bridewells.

Is his salary increased?—No, it is not increased, the maximum salary by law is 100*l.* a year, which he has, but the great hardship which he labours under is with respect to the Smithfield penitentiary, he had a salary of 120*l.* a year, as clerical visitor in that prison, under government.

When that penitentiary was under government?—Yes; he enjoyed that for twenty-one years, when the government gave up that penitentiary, and it became a city prison, the duty of that penitentiary was then added to his other duties, but he lost the salary.

Did he state his case to the grand jury?—He did; the grand jury regretted they could not interfere, but recommended the case strongly to the lord lieutenant, but the lord lieutenant had not power to interfere, though his case was one of extreme hardship.

Who is the architect for the prisons in Dublin?—Henry Aaron Baker.

Will you state his salary and his duties?—His salary is fifty guineas a year, and his duty is to check all building accounts, and for repairs; to inspect all works; to attend the grand jury; to suggest repairs, and to see that they are properly executed; his duty has been more than doubled, without increase of salary.

Do

Rev. P. R. Gamble.

(12 May.)

Do they examine him as to the necessity of repairs before they pass a presentment for them?—They do; he is always obliged to attend them.

Will you state the nature of the duties of inspector of accounts?—The inspector of accounts is obliged to attend the grand jury at all times, to check all accounts that go before the grand jury, and all presentments before they are passed; to check them both as their amount and propriety; he has to certify them all to the grand jury, and to strike the assessments on the parishes.

Is not the inspector of accounts appointed according to Act of Parliament?—He is.

Does not the Act regulating the presentments for the city of Dublin, differ from the general grand jury Act, appointing this officer?—It does, for the county and city of Dublin; the county officer has 300 *l.* a year.

In your opinion, why is such an officer more necessary in the county and city of Dublin than in other counties?—I think the business heavier in the county and city of Dublin than in other counties; peculiarly, I think, the business of the accountant much heavier.

Is not the criminal business in the city of Dublin much more closely connected with the duty of the various officers under the control of the grand juries, than in the counties?—It is.

Could this office be dispensed with, without inconvenience to the public?—I do not think it could.

Are you aware of any grand jurors, either on terms or on sessions, or on commissions, having supplied articles for the prisons; and, if you are, state them?—I am aware of gentlemen being on the term grand jury, who have supplied articles.

Who are they?—I think Alderman Nugent has supplied articles to the term grand jury.

Do you know anything about any other person?—I think Mr. Studdart has.

Do you know whether Mr. Manders did?—No, he did not; I recollect a circumstance respecting Alderman Manders, about ten years ago, that would prove that decidedly.

Do you know anything about Mr. Read, a plumber?—I do: Mr. Read was city plumber, and he executed some works in that line.

Who was he connected with in the corporation?—He was an alderman.

He was on the grand jury?—Yes, he was often on the grand jury.

Do you know Mr. Craven, an apothecary?—I do, very well.

Does he supply the prisons with medicine?—He does.

Has he been on the grand jury?—I think I can state distinctly, he has not been on the grand jury for six years; I have not seen him there for six years, but he had been frequently before.

Do you know any other person who supplies articles, who has been on the term grand juries; do you know anything about Alderman Exshaw?—I do.

What does he supply?—Stationery.

Do you know anything about Alderman Darley, a stone cutter?—I do.

Does he supply anything?—No.

Do you know anything about a clock purchased from Mr. Warner?—I never heard anything about the clock purchased from Mr. Warner till I came here; but I believe it to be strictly the fact.

Mr. Warner was an alderman?—He was; he is dead.

Did you hear that the price of that clock was 375 *l.*?—I did since I came hear.

Do you believe it?—I do; but that was not paid out of the grand jury cess; at least, I cannot say so positively.

Can you state, whether it was by order of the grand jury, or by contract from the grand jury, that Mr. Warner supplied it?—I believe the commissioners of bridewell ordered it.

How was it paid for?—By the commissioners of Richmond bridewell.

Was it the government or the grand jury, that had the control over that money?—The grand jury had no control whatever over that money; it was the commissioners appointed by government.

It was not voted by the grand jury?—The only thing that the grand jury had to say to that money, was paying it back at the rate of 2,600 *l.* a year.

Have the grand jury the power of rejecting or allowing that money?—I do not believe the grand jury had any power whatever respecting it.

Do you know any thing of Mr. Sheriff Thorp's profession or business?—I do.

What is his profession?—He is I believe a plasterer, builder and painter.

Does

Rev. *P. R. Gamble.*

(12 May.)

Does he do any of those works for the grand jury?—He does, by contract.

Is he one of the grand jury himself generally?—I think I have seen him on one grand jury.

Do you think that any of his own accounts came before him, or before the grand jury when he did serve thereon?—Indeed I should imagine so, if he had any at that time.

In what degree of relationship are any of the following contractors or officers to any of the grand jurors, namely, Darley the treasurer; is Alderman Darley upon the grand juries frequently?—He had been formerly, but latterly not.

Do you imagine that there came before him the account of his brother to inspect?—Most undoubtedly.

Do you know Mr. Montgomery, secretary to the grand jury?—I do.

Which of those persons who serve on grand juries is he connected with?—He is son-in-law to Alderman Exshaw.

Presentments are made to the secretary?—They are.

And Alderman Exshaw is one of the presenters?—He is generally one of the grand jury, and a most useful member of it.

What connection has Dr. Harty the physician with any of the grand jurors?—Doctor Harty is brother to Alderman Harty.

Does Alderman Harty generally serve on the grand juries?—I think I have seen Alderman Harty less on grand juries than other aldermen.

Do you know Mr. Read the surgeon?—I do.

Who is he connected with on the grand juries?—I cannot answer that; I can tell you what corporation man he is connected with; he is connected with Mr. Long the sheriff's peer.

Does Mr. Long serve on the grand juries?—He has been on grand juries.

Do you know Mr. Bourne the gaoler?—I do.

What member of the corporation is he connected with?—I have ascertained exactly since I was before the Committee yesterday; Bourne's wife is the daughter of Alderman Archer's first wife, by a former husband.

Does Alderman Archer serve on grand juries?—He does.

What do you say of Purdon, the governor of bridewell?—He is son-in-law of Alderman Archer.

Are presentments made to the governor of the bridewell?—Yes, for his salary.

Do you know Mr. Isaac Manders, the contractor for bread?—No; I have seen him, but not often.

Who is the contractor for bread?—The contractor for bread now is Rickard.

Who is he connected with belonging to the corporation?—I believe he is not connected with any one.

Can you state to the Committee any shopman or foreman of any of the grand jurors having got any contract from the grand jury?—I think Alderman Darley's man, who was his foreman, has got contracts, but he is not connected with him now.

Is Alderman Darley upon the grand jury?—He is sometimes, but Alderman Darley, as I believe, is not connected with the man now.

Do you know any other?—I think a man of the name of Dalton gets contracts, who was foreman to Alderman Nugent when he was in business.

Can you state any connection between any grand juror and any contractor in any other respect?—I declare unless it is called to my mind I cannot; if any one circumstance is called to my mind it may assist me, and all I know I shall tell.

Richardson, who had the contract for potatoes, had six pounds per ton, who is he in partnership with?—I do not know.

Was he in partnership with a Mr. Whitford?—Never, I believe.

Have you in your capacity of inspector any control over the stationery, medicines, or what is called necessaries, furnished by several individuals?—I have no control over the stationery or medicines, or the necessaries furnished for the sick, but as to the clothes, I have a control, not over the contract, but a checking on the receipt of them.

What articles do you inspect?—I inspect clothes, blankets, bedsteads and food, in conjunction with the other officers.

Any thing else?—Coals, straw, bread, milk and herrings.

Do you know whether Mr. Darley, the treasurer, ever served the office of sub-sheriff?—I believe he did, but not in my memory.

Did Alexander Montgomery, the secretary and attorney to the grand jury, ever serve the office of sub-sheriff?—I think so, but not within my memory.

Rev.
P. R. Gamble.
(12 May.)

Were both in their respective situations of treasurer and secretary at the time when they so served?—I do not know, but I should think so.

If they were, did not those gentlemen summon grand jurors to pass their own accounts?—By inference I should of course think so; I believe the sheriff and the sub-sheriff have the making out of the panels.

Did William White and George Archer serve the office of sub-sheriff?—Yes, I recollect they did.

Are they partners, and under what firm?—I believe they are partners; attorneys, under the firm of White and Archer, or Archer and White, I am not certain which.

Can you state the respective years the secretary served the office of sub-sheriff? —I cannot.

Can you state whether it was not from the 29th of September 1819, to the same date in 1820?—I declare, I cannot; because I have nothing to say to the sub-sheriff, his is an office I have not been in ten times in my life.

Do you give the same answer as to Mr. Archer?—I have nothing to do with the sub-sheriff at all.

Are you aware, that any grand juror, inspector, chaplain, physician, surgeon, or apothecary, becomes liable to a fine of five hundred pounds, if he participates in the profits of any contracts?—I am aware that such is the law.

Do you conceive that any grand juror would, for the profits arising from such contracts as are made by the grand juries, be likely to expose himself to such a fine?—I should think not.

Have you ever known a prosecution under that law?—I have not; but I have known the circumstance that a grand jury has gone into court and sworn that he had nothing to say to a contract, when it has been publicly said that he had an interest in it.

Have you any suggestions to offer in relation to the possible improvement of the Dublin prisons?—I have, both as to the improvement of the prisons, and as to some regulations relative to the grand jury cess.

Will you have the goodness to state them?—I should propose that yearly contracts should be made in place of half yearly contracts for all articles of diet.

Do you conceive there is any objection to making yearly contracts under the law as it now stands?—I have asked grand juries, and they do not feel themselves authorized to make yearly contracts; that would be for the sake of the contractors in food, as well as for the sake of preventing the accounts from being confused: if a man contracts for milk and gets the summer half year and gets in a store of cattle, if he loses the contract for the winter half year, he is severely injured; a man must make up his accounts the first day of the term and send them in, the same man must supply to the last day of the term; therefore, if that man loses the contract, there must be a small balance on the face of the account due to him; but though very small in any one instance, yet the frequent occurrence of it is troublesome.

That inconvenience would exist if you had annual contracts, but it would exist only once a year instead of twice?—Certainly; I would propose that the payments for all contracts should be by ready money, which would save twenty per cent.; I can give an instance of that in the clothes; this suit of clothes cost, under the grand jury, at nine month's credit, nineteen shillings.

At what price could it be procured for ready money?—Fifteen and three-pence, I procured it for the government at ready money; and I should propose that the salaries should be paid at least when due, because instances have occurred when I have not received my salary for four months or more, after it has been due.

Is it the general opinion with regard to salaries, that they are held liable to traverse, if the officer misconducts himself?—Decidedly; if the officer misconducts himself, any complaint which is made to the court of King's Bench, would be followed by a suspension of the salary.

Have you ever known a salary traversed in the court below, and tried by a petit jury?—Never; I have known all the presentments opposed, including salaries and all.

Have you ever known any representation made of the misconduct of officers?—No, not to the court; I would suggest that the Act of Parliament relating to clothing, should be strictly complied with in all cases of prisoners tried and convicted; that the clothing should be of a coarse and cheap quality, to be approved of by three magistrates of the head office of police: I would also propose, that prisoners when convicted, should get on the prison dress, and when discharged, should get their own.

Rev. P. R. Gamble. (12 May.)

Is not that the plan now?—No; that Act of Parliament has not come into full force: I would also propose, that visitors should not be permitted to see prisoners after trial, except in cases of very good behaviour, or by the approbation of the magistrates, or proper officers; and that all prisoners in Newgate should be fed on the gaol allowance.

Do you mean whether they could afford to maintain themselves or not?—It creates a great deal of confusion in not doing it, because we are obliged to keep all prisoners who are not fed on the gaol allowance, in a yard by themselves; also that a cooked dietary should be substituted in Newgate, and that the prisoners should breakfast and dine at stated hours; that no fermented liquors of any kind should be permitted, save for medicinal purposes, and ordered by the inspector, physician or surgeon, in writing.

Do you mean to prisoners before trial, as well as after trial?—Indeed, I should never wish to see any liquors of any kind in gaol; I should make a distinction for debtors of course, but there are no debtors in Newgate now; it might be subject to an order from higher authority, or subject to an order from the court of King's Bench: with respect to the city marshalsea, I will state exactly what the prison is; it is a very bad and ill-constructed prison for prisoners, committed, as they are generally, for small debts; some on city actions, for debts to any amount; the former liquidate their debts either by payment or time; time means that each and every day they are detained, pays a debt at the rate, as well as I can recollect, of one shilling per day, for debts of twenty or forty shillings, they pay at that rate by staying twenty or forty days: much difficulty exists in getting repairs made at this prison, as there is an uncertainty about the mode of payment.

Have you ever known any grand jury presentment for the repairs?—I have.

Have you ever known any objection to them?—I have.

On what ground?—That the corporation should support its own prison.

Have you known the corporation to repair it?—In two or three instances I have.

In what state of repair is it?—It is now in a good state of repair, owing to a storm, which at the time caused serious injury to the prison.

At whose expense was it repaired?—By the grand jury; this prison is under the corporation of the city of Dublin, and should be supported at the expense of the corporation, but I have heard that it was in contemplation, to allow somewhat out of the funds of the court of conscience for its support; I think 100*l.* a year would support the prison and pay the marshal, who has stated to me that there are three years salary due to him.

Who should pay it?—The corporation.

William Harty, M. D. called in; and Examined.

Dr. William Harty.

WHAT is your profession?—I am a physician.

What public official situation do you fill; how long have you filled it, and how were you appointed?—I am physician to all the prisons of Dublin, with the exception of the four court marshalsea which is under government, and the Grange Gorman Lane penitentiary.

Will you state the names of the prisons?—Newgate, the city marshalsea, the sheriff's prison, the Richmond bridewell, and the Smithfield penitentiary; I was appointed by the grand jury in Easter term 1812, and being approved of by the court of King's Bench, am by law an officer of that court.

Had you been a candidate for the office on any former occasion?—I had been a candidate for the office, on the death of Doctor Scott, in or about the year 1809, when Doctor Mills was appointed, and the votes were almost equally divided upon that occasion.

You did not succeed at that time?—Doctor Mills was then appointed; afterwards Doctor Mills was bequeathed a considerable property in the county of Wicklow, and having resigned the office, I was then appointed.

Had you any relatives upon the grand jury at the time of your election?—None; at the present moment I have a brother who is an alderman, and also a brother-in-law who is an alderman; but my brother was elected last year only; my brother-in-law was not, as well as I can recollect, an alderman at the period of my election; at least if he was, it was immediately before the period of the election.

But he did not serve upon the grand jury which elected you physician?—I do not now recollect.

What salary was attached to your office at the time of your election, and what

Dr. William Harty, (12 May.)

now?—Three hundred pounds a year was attached to my office, at the time of my election, the same as was paid to my predecessor; it is now 400*l.* a year.

Is there any maximum fixed to the salary of the physician?—At present there is none; it is for obvious reasons left to the discretion of the grand jury to make compensation according to the amount of duty.

By what Act of Parliament is it repealed?—By the 50th of the late King; before that the maximum was 100*l.* a year.

What is the difference between the duties now to be performed, and those at the time of your election?—At the time of my appointment, the prisons I had to attend to were Newgate, the city marshalsea, and the sheriffs prison, which from the number of criminals then committed afforded very little duty compared with the present amount thereof; there was also a small prison which contained generally forty or fifty prisoners, but that prison gave me no duty, the prisoners, being chiefly monthly prisoners, and under charge of the surgeon; there was no medical hospital, and if any person was sick, my simple duty was to order the removal of that person to the hospitals of the house of industry, so that that prison gave me no duty; the increase of my duties now arises from the immense increase of prisoners, with the addition of two new prisons, Richmond bridewell and Smithfield penitentiary; and the Richmond bridewell contains nearly twice as many prisoners as Newgate did at the time of my appointment, and the Smithfield penitentiary as many.

When did that great increase of duty commence?—The increase was gradual with respect to the number of prisoners, there was a considerable increase of my duties in 1815; there was a great increase of duty also at the sheriff's prison under the operation of the insolvent acts, that prison being then excessively crowded; but the essential increase from the additional prisons took place in 1818, on the opening of the Richmond bridewell, and a still further increase in 1821, by the opening of the Smithfield penitentiary.

When was your salary raised to its present amount?—At Easter term 1822.

Had you in the interval made any application to the grand jury for an increase of your salary?—I made two or three applications by letter and in person to the grand jury immediately after the great increase of duty by the addition of Richmond bridewell; I made these different applications in vain, for the grand jury, though admitting at the same time the great increase of my duty, said they did not feel themselves warranted under the existing distress of the city, to make any addition to the salary.

Had you any relative on those grand juries at that time?—I had.

And those grand juries refused to sanction your application?—They did.

How did you ultimately succeed?—I found it useless to apply to the grand jury; and therefore I addressed a memorial, in Easter term 1822, to the grand jury, and at the same time sent a copy of it to the judges of the court of King's Bench, having waited on Judge Jebb for that purpose.

Have you a copy of the memorial?—I have, and also a copy of the letter from Judge Jebb, after he had submitted the memorial to the judges of the court.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which are as follows:*]

> " To the Foreman and Gentlemen of the Easter Term Grand Jury for the year 1822.
>
> " The Memorial of William Harty, physician to the prisons of Dublin,
>
> " Respectfully sheweth,—
>
> " That memorialist was appointed in the year 1812 physician to the prisons, at a salary of 300*l.* per annum, the same as was paid to his predecessor in office; that the only prisons which then, and until the year 1818, called for memorialist's regular attendance, were the sheriff's prison, city marshalsea and Newgate, the old bridewell in James's-street, having had no medical hospital and containing but few prisoners; that, at the time of memorialist's appointment, the number of annual committals to Newgate did not exceed 800, whereas they have for several years amounted to 2,000; and, though the labour of memorialist has thereby been greatly increased, he would, notwithstanding such increase, still consider himself as receiving a fair remuneration, had not other duties, to a serious extent, been required of him. That, since the year 1818, memorialist has attended the Richmond bridewell; a prison which, from its remote situation and the number of sick supplied by its numerous inmates, is a source of greater labour and loss of time,

Dr. *William Harty*, (12 May.)

time, than all the other prisons together; and that memorialist has not received any compensation for such attendance. That, in addition to the said attendance on the Richmond bridewell, memorialist was, in the summer of 1821, required, by the magistrates of the head office of police, to visit the Smithfield penitentiary; a duty which, in like manner, memorialist has continued to discharge without any compensation:—Memorialist, therefore, respectfully submits these facts to the consideration of the grand jury, in the confident hope, that the gentlemen who compose it, will, on inquiry, be of opinion, that memorialist's duties have been greatly increased since his appointment; and that, though for some time past these duties have been more than doubled, he has regularly and faithfully discharged the same, without receiving such reasonable compensation as the law empowers the grand jury to grant in the case of memorialist, and which a former grand jury liberally granted to him for a mere temporary attendance at Kilmainham. Memorialist therefore respectfully prays, that the grand jury will be pleased to present for your memorialist, such reasonable increase of salary as his additional duties may, in their judgment, fairly entitle him to receive."

"Copy of Judge Jebb's note to Dr. Harty, dated 5th May 1822.

"Judge Jebb's compliments to Dr. Harty. He has shown his memorial to the Chief Justice and Judge Burton; and they are of opinion, in which Judge Jebb entirely concurs, that the great increase of duty, and the very meritorious manner in which it is performed, entitle Dr. Harty to an increase of salary; and that, if the grand jury shall make a presentment, it ought to receive the fiat of the court."

"Rutland-square, 5th May 1822."

In consequence of the recommendation of the judge, was not your salary raised to its present amount?—The circumstances were very peculiar at that time; on the opening of the term, Judge Jebb charged both the city and the county grand juries on the subject of economy, and if, after such a charge the question lay with the grand jury alone, I was certain that my application would be rejected, and therefore I was the more anxious to explain the circumstances of the case; and Judge Jebb's statement was, that his charge with respect to economy, never was intended to prevent the grand jury from making proper remuneration to their officers for increased duties, but referred to various other departments to which economy can be carried.

What was the result?—The result was, that I laid the letter from Judge Jebb with my memorial before the grand jury, and the application was granted.

Will you explain to the Committee what are your special means of information on the subject of grand jury cess?—My official connection with the grand jury and the prisons necessarily affords me some means; but the special means of information that I possess, arise from a very minute investigation of the subject, since the publication of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, which drew my attention to the subject.

What is the opinion generally entertained of that tax, by the citizens of Dublin?—The opinion almost universally entertained is, that it is exorbitant and oppressive, enormous in its amount. and there is a very general impression that great abuses exist in its appropriation and management.

What do you consider the causes of the prevalence of such an opinion?—I consider that the causes of such an opinion are the very universal ignorance that exists respecting it, and that very general and natural prejudice which readily believes the existence of abuses.

What is your own opinion?—My own opinion, led by the general current, had been an unfavourable one, and it was only changed by inquiry.

What is the nature of the inquiry that you have made?—The nature of the inquiry that I made, consisted in a very minute examination of all the grand jury warrants to which I could procure access, and of all the other documents which could afford information on the subject.

What led you to the inquiry; was it at the desire of the grand jury or altogether spontaneous?—The inquiry was instituted at the desire of the officers of the prisons at large, without the knowledge, sanction or concurrence of any other persons whatsoever, and was specially conducted by the inspector and myself, and it was owing, as I stated before, to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons of last session.

Dr. William Harty, (12 May.)

What has been the result of that inquiry?—It has been a conviction that great error exists respecting the subject, and that the more minutely we inquire and investigate it, the less we shall be disposed to think the tax exorbitant, or liable to much abuse.

Would you therefore recommend no change in the present system?—Certainly, I would recommend changes, but they would be in Acts of Parliament, not in acts of the grand jury.

State the changes which you would propose?—The changes that appear to me specially necessary are three, two of which would affect all the local taxes, and would contribute to give relief, with respect to all, and the third respects the grand jury cess alone; the changes that I should recommend are, *first*, in the principle upon which the local taxes should be applotted, modifying or changing that principle, it being founded on the very unequal asessment of minister's money.

Do you allude to a new assessment?—I will, if necessary, explain that to the Committee hereafter, but I am now merely mentioning the three changes; the change in that respect is absolutely necessary, not so much as lessening the amount of the tax itself, but as it would enable the tax to be levied so as to bear more equally, and therefore less oppressively on the citizens. The *second* change would be with respect to the mode of collecting all the local taxes; and the *third* change would consist either in altering the existing law, by which commitments to the Dublin prisons are regulated, or by passing such Act as may lead the county of Dublin to bear its due proportion of the expense; there are also minor modes by which relief could be afforded in economizing in the presentments, and especially by enabling purchases to be made with ready money.

What grand juries are entrusted with the power of presenting for the grand jury cess?—There are two presenting term grand juries, the Easter and the Michaelmas; and there are four sessional grand juries.

Will you state the distinction between the presentments made by the term and the sessional grand juries?—Originally there had been little or no distinction, for *all* the term grand juries could present, and all the sessional grand juries could present for every object in common; whence arose a great deal of confusion; so that the jurisdiction of each, with regard to presentments, is now clearly regulated; and the regulation now is, that the sessions grand juries present for all expenses connected with the prosecution of offenders, and the maintenance of the sessions house as a court of justice.

Do you mean the prosecution of prisoners at sessions?—Yes, at the sessions; the term grand juries present for the prosecution of prisoners at commission; the session grand juries also present for the rent of rooms for the accommodation of the officers of the gaol guard; and the term grand juries present for roads and bridges (not over the Liffey) and for the maintenance of prisoners, the payment of all officers, the repairs and building of prisons, and all the other objects from which sessions grand jury are now precluded.

Have the commission grand juries any power of presenting or raising money?—None; their jurisdiction is altogether criminal.

Have the grand juries a very extensive discretion in passing contracts?—Their discretion, as far as it exists at all, is strictly limited by law, that is, they can present for nothing that they are not authorized to do by Act of Parliament; but take the presentments for any one year, examine each presentment in detail, and supposing the amount to be 25,000 *l.* in a year, I will venture to say, that 5,000 *l.* of it is not at discretion, and their discretion over even that 5,000 *l.* is very limited.

What are the objects for which presentments are usually made by the term grand juries of Dublin?—The term grand jury presentments, in fact, embrace all others, because the presentments made by the sessions grand jury, come before the term grand jury and the court finally to be fiated, in order that the whole may be collected by the same collectors; the objects for which the presentments are made may be classed under twelve distinct heads: first, the sessional presentment, the nature of which I have explained; then there are presentments for certain hospitals and dispensaries in Dublin; the third is for poundage paid to the collector of the cess and of the Anna Liffey and Wide-street tax, (the Anna Liffey tax is now abolished;) and allowances on account of those two taxes to certain officers, which come under the same head; fourthly, the expenses attending the trial of prisoners at commission; the fifth head is for coroners for inquests; the sixth head is for roads, and walls to protect certain roads from the encroachments of the sea, which are sources of great expense; the seventh head embraces all repairs, new works and rents paid

Dr. William Harty,

(12 May.)

paid for the several prisons; the eighth head includes food, clothing, bedding, coals, oil, soap, candles, and employment for about eight hundred criminal prisoners, for that may be considered the average number of the criminal prisoners in the Dublin prisons; under the ninth head are the charges for stationary, advertisements, costs and petty expenses for the prisons; under the tenth head, charges for medicines, and necessaries for the sick, and the payments made to the nurses or hospital superintendents; under the eleventh head, payments made to the principal officers of the prisons, (sixteen in number) and to inferior officers and servants, (twenty-eight in number;) and under the twelfth and last head, are instalments to repay money borrowed from government.

Were any other subjects besides those, formerly matters for presentments?—There were various other objects formerly presented for, that now are not, for example, for building bridges over the Liffey, the support of conformed Popish priests, which did not cease till within the last ten years; the transporting of felons, which was entirely at the expense of the city, and is now at the expense of government; there were the making of pavements and sewers in the city; rewards for apprehending robbers, and prosecuting constables; raising and equipping the militia; census of the population, and various other objects.

How far back have you gone in examining the grand jury warrants?—To the year 1764.

What is the gross amount of those warrants, from that period to the year 1822 inclusive?—The gross amount of presentments for the fifty-nine years, amounts to 557,880 *l.* making, upon the whole, a yearly average of 9,455 *l.*

Have you made any calculation how that sum has been expended?—I have made such a calculation, taken from the warrants themselves, and of that sum above 85,000 was expended in the erection of the various prisons of Dublin, and public buildings connected with the administration of justice; about 30,000 *l.* in the erection of bridges; 30,000 *l.* in the repairing of roads; above 20,000 *l.* to public hospitals and dispensaries; about 15,000 *l.* in raising and equipping the militia of the city; above 5,000 *l.* in certain Acts of Parliament on the commission of perambulation, and a census of the population; about 45,000 *l.* for the poundage paid to collectors for collecting the Grand Jury tax, the Wide-street tax, and the Anna Liffey tax, &c.; about 50,000 *l.* for sessional presentments for the prosecution of prisoners, for fees remitted, and for paying all the charges connected with the maintaining the sessions house as a court of justice; about 24,000 *l.* for the supplying medicines and necessaries for the sick, during the period of forty years; about 40,000 *l.* more in numberless sundries, which could scarcely be enumerated; leaving a balance of 208,000 *l.* for providing food, clothing, bedding, employment, coals, candles, soap and other necessaries for the prisoners of the Dublin gaols during the period of fifty-nine years; also for the various repairs of the prisons, and for the payment of officers and servants during the same time.

The Committee have before them the returns of the grand jury assessments, from 1807 to 1820 inclusive; can you state any previous and subsequent returns, or can you give any general view of the whole?—I think I can lay before the Committee a view of the presentments for the last fifty-nine years, which will explain satisfactorily, I hope, the causes of the progressive increase of presentments from the year 1764 to the present day, I have divided that interval of time into four periods

When do you commence?—The first period embraces twenty-three years, from 1764 to 1786 inclusive; the second period embraces twelve years, from 1787 to 1798 inclusive; the third period consists of twelve years, from 1799 to 1810 inclusive; and the fourth period of twelve years, from 1811 to 1822 inclusive. In the first period the lowest amount of presentment was for the year 1766, 963 *l.*; the highest for 1764, was 4,925 *l.*

That is the highest and lowest amount of annual presentments in the first period?—Yes; in the calculation of the first period, there were four deficient years that I could not supply, and these were taken at 3,000 *l.* each, the average of the whole period being only 2,675 *l.* thereby making the whole assessment of the first twenty three years 61,539 *l.*; in the second period the lowest presentment was for the year 1789, being 6,989 *l.*; the greatest was for the year 1795, being 12,672 *l.* The total amount of presentments in the second period was 108,825 *l.* making the average 9,068 *l.* In the third period of twelve years, the lowest presentment was in the year 1805, being 8,368 *l.*; and the highest for the year 1809, being 18,329 *l.* The total of the third period amounts to 137,405 *l.* making an annual average of 11,450 *l.*

(Dr. *William Harty*, 12 May.)

11,450 *l.* In the fourth period, the lowest assessment was for the year 1812, being 16,154 *l.* and the highest for the year 1821, being 27,515 *l*; the total of the fourth period amounting to 250,111 *l.* makes an annual average of 20,842 *l.* On reviewing these four periods, it will appear that the second period embracing twelve years, far exceeded the first embracing twenty-three years. The third period only exceeds the second (embracing the same term) by about 25,000 *l.* The fourth period, however, is nearly double the third, though embracing the same term of time; and it will obviously be very necessary to explain, why the second period of twelve years so much exceeds the first of twenty three years, and why the last or fourth period should be nearly double either the second or third; and I think on reviewing the presentments that were made in those periods, the causes will be evident and satisfactory. In the first period of twenty-three years the great sources of positive expense were for bridges, amounting to upwards of 10,000 *l.* for the building of the present Newgate exceeding 10,000 *l.* and also for transporting felons about 2,500 *l.* The causes why the expenses were so low in these first twenty-three years are, that in the first place there were very few prisoners; for so late as the year 1782 and 1783, when the illustrious Howard visited the prisons of Dublin, he stated the number of prisoners to be about 120, and on the second visit to amount to about 150, therefore there were but few prisoners. In the next place they were ill fed, and many of them not fed at all; *viz.* those who were retained for the fees, the daily allowance of food being only twopence worth of bread. In the next place, for a great part of this first period, there were no fees remitted at all to prisoners, and when first remitted, they were remitted but partially; an Act of Parliament being occasionally passed remitting all fees for the prisoners then in confinement. In the next place, there were no medicines allowed the prisoners, there was no inspector, no physician nor chaplain, there was no bedding provided, and there were no turnkeys but the criminals themselves, there was scarcely any compensation, a very small salary only being paid to the gaoler, who was thus forced to live by plunder on the prisoners; and it was not till the year 1786, that the deputy gaoler was appointed. The Committee may judge of the expense of supporting the prisoners at this time by the fact, that the half year's presentment for bread in the year 1765, amounted to 72 *l.* only, and in the year 1778 to 120 *l.* These are the causes why the first period was so high as it was, and also why it fell so far short of the expenses of the second period. The special causes why the second period, embracing twelve years, so far exceeded the first, embracing twenty-three years are, that three new prisons were erected, and Newgate was, besides, completed in that period; the total expense of those objects alone amounted to 19,456 *l.* The sessions house besides was erected in this period, and the expense thereof, during those twelve years, amounted to 6,970 *l.* Poundage also for the allowance to collectors commenced in this period, the annual amount of which has been for many years about 2,000 *l.*; bridges also were erected amounting to 4,692 *l.*; the repairs on the Rock road, and for walls against the sea were very heavy, amounting to about 5,000 *l.*; there were four new officers appointed, the physician, inspector, chaplain, and coroner; medicines too, were first presented for in this period; a commission of perambulation also issued, which was a source of heavy expense.

What is that commission for?—For ascertaining the boundaries between the city and county; and in consequence of the difficulty of doing so, an Act of Parliament passed for extending the jurisdiction of the recorder.

Were not there maps of the city and county?—There were maps; but the difficulty of ascertaining whether the prisoner was taken in the city or county, was so great, that culprits were sometimes enabled to escape. In this period also the Dublin militia was raised, the expense 6,629 *l.*; the food provided for prisoners was much better, and in greater quantity, of which an example may be had in the presentment for Newgate in the year 1798, when the expense of bread, for half a year, amounted to 600 *l.* and in the preceding period, it seldom exceeded 100 *l.*; there was also an increase of prisoners; and fees began to be more liberally remitted; necessaries also, and bedding, were now provided by the public for prisoners; also turnkeys were appointed in place of criminals. The total extras of this period, in different new presentments, actually made beyond the twenty-three preceding years, amounted to about 66,000 *l.* In the third period, the expenditure of which exceeded the second by about 25,000 *l.* the same causes were continued, viz. the Dublin militia and army of reserve; the expense of which amounted to 4,000 *l.*; the sessions house to about 5,000 *l.*; the new prison to upwards of 4,000 *l.*; commission of perambulation

Dr. William Harty.

(12 May.)

perambulation, poundage, roads, &c.; but the new causes which specially raised the presentments for this third period, were, that three new bridges were built, the expense of which amounted to 13,772*l.* There was a greater allowance of food, the statute requiring five-pence per day as the minimum expenditure on each prisoner, and more if necessary; there was also a gradual increase of prisoners; there was an additional officer, an inspector of accounts, appointed; and in this period, during the progress of the war, there was a considerable depreciation in the value of money, and a consequent rise in the necessaries of life. The total extras of this period amount to about 30,000 *l.* The fourth period, however, is that which comes under the most serious consideration of the Committee, because it includes a period extending from the year 1811 to the year 1822, and because the expenditure, as I have stated already, amounting to about 250,000*l.* is nearly double the expenditure of the second or third period; the causes why the expenditure in this fourth period is so heavy are, that in the very first year of it the erection of the Richmond bridewell commenced; the sums paid for the mere erection of that prison, amounting in this period to 25,150*l.*; there was the Pigeon House road repaired at an expense of 1,447 *l.*; there were new officers appointed; the chaplains, formerly there had been only the Protestant chaplain, now there is also a Presbyterian and a Roman catholic chaplain; there were also nurses, which had not been allowed before; there was a census of the population, at an expense of 1,000*l.*; there was an immense increase in the number of prisoners, and the expense for additional accommodation; there was besides, during a period of nearly three years, a high rate of provisions, such as has not been known in Ireland during the memory of any person living, so that when, in the year 1815, the total expense for the maintenance of prisoners amounted to 2,762*l.* the expenditure for the same objects, for food and necessaries, amounted, in 1816, to 3,935*l.*; in 1817, to 5,283*l.*; and in 1818, to 4,410*l.*; these being years of great distress in Ireland; the total expense of food and necessaries during the last eight years, amounts to 36,377*l.* making an annual average of 4,542*l.*; the great increase of expense on this head may be estimated by the fact, that on the average of the year 1800, the total expenses for the same purposes, amounted to about 1,500*l.* being a difference of 3,000*l.* annually, between the expense at that time, and during the last eight years; during the same period of distress from famine, there was also great sickness in all the prisons; hence a frequent removal of convicts to Kilmainham, and heavy expenses attendant thereon. There was also, in the years 1818 and 1819, an immense increase of expenditure from the furnishing of Richmond bridewell, and from the alterations requisite in it, amounting to the sum of 16,940*l.* There was also the opening and the furnishing of another prison, the Smithfield penitentiary; there was considerable expense also, in providing employment for prisoners, which had never been done previously; and there was a further annual expense of near 2,000*l.* for the additional officers and servants, necessary for these new prisons; also for clothing the prisoners; and a further great increase of expense from prosecuting the immensely increased number of prisoners; the difference in the expense of prosecuting prisoners, may be estimated from this fact, that in 1822, the sessional presentments for the fees to clerks of the peace, to gaolers, to the sheriff, and to the crier, amounted to 2,801*l.* and in 1816 (even when the number of prisoners had considerably increased), the same expenses amounted to about 1,700*l.* making a difference of more than 1,000*l.* in the year; so that there was a total extra expenditure in this period in new presentments of 50,000*l.* and in increased presentments from the increase of prisoners, prisons and officers, from feeding, prosecuting, clothing, accommodating and employing the increased number of prisoners, there was an additional extra expenditure of upwards of 60,000*l.* making the total extra expenditure of this fourth period 110,000 *l.* beyond any former period. The Committee may further judge of the immense pressure within the last twelve years, from this single fact, that the cost of the Richmond bridewell, for the last four years, during which it has been opened, including the expense for building and re-paying sums advanced by government, amounted, in 1819, to 7,783 *l.*; in 1820, to 8,909 *l.*; in 1821, to 9,311 *l.*; and in 1822, to 7,214 *l.* making an average in four years of 8,384 *l.* (exclusive of savings and profits on labour to the amount of 2,500 *l.*) an annual expense far exceeding the sum total of former annual assessments; so that, for the Richmond bridewell alone, erected and occupied during this period, the expenditure exceeds the total annual presentments made so lately as the year 1805; and besides Richmond bridewell, there was a second prison, the Smithfield penitentiary, to be furnished and supported.

Dr.
William Harty.

(12 May.)

Do not you think that the citizens of Dublin must have suffered very much by this great increase?—Beyond all question they must have suffered, but before they complained they ought to have inquired into the grounds for complaint; they very naturally would have inquired when they found the cess increase, then they should have inquired, what were the grounds of the increase; and the reasons of that increase appear by the warrants themselves.

While the assessments have thus varied from year to year, sometimes more and sometimes less, how do you account for the ultimate and great increase?—The ultimate and great increase which exists at present, and which must continue at the same rate for some time, depends upon the necessity of employing a greater number of prisons than formerly, of repairing all those prisons, paying a necessary increase of officers and servants, and of prosecuting and supporting an immensely increased number of criminal prisoners.

How do you account for the assessment of 1821 (the maximum year) exceeding that of 1822, by upwards of 2,000 *l.*?—In the year 1821, the Smithfield penitentiary was opened, producing an additional expense of nearly 2,000 *l.* so that the year 1822 fell short to that amount.

Have you made any calculation as to the increase of committals to the gaol of Newgate?—I have taken a period of eighteen years, and divided it into intervals of six years each; in the first period, from 1805 to 1810 inclusive, the committals amounted to 4,474; in the second period of six years, from 1811 to 1816 inclusive, the committals amounted to 6,510; and in the last period of six years, from 1817 to 1822, they amounted to 11,882, being more, by nearly a thousand, than the whole preceding twelve years.

Are the committals still on the increase?—From the returns I saw in Newgate of the committals, before my departure from Dublin, I would say, that if they go on for the remainder of the year at the same rate as during the first three months, they will amount to nearly 3,000 in the year.

From what class of prisoners is the greatest expense incurred, from capital and and transportable criminals, or from those for a term of confinement?—Certainly from those who are under terms of confinement.

What proportion do those convictions bear to each other, in each series of six years?—I have made a calculation on that head, which will show that the prisoners for a term of confinement have increased; thereby accounting also for an increased expenditure in the first series of six years alluded to, transportable offences formed one-ninth of the committals. In the second period less than one-tenth, and in the third less than one-thirteenth; the executions were to the committals in the first series, as 1 to 131; in the second period they were, as 1 to 500; and in the third series as 1 to 850; in the last year there was not a single execution at Dublin. The confined prisoners, that is those for a term of confinement, were to the committals, in the first series as 13 to 15; in the second series as 11½ to 15; and in the third series as 10 to 11, showing a considerable increase in that class of prisoners.

Have you made an analysis of the assessments of any one year, under the several heads that you have already enumerated?—I have made an analysis of the year 1822, under the several heads stated, so that I could enumerate to the Committee the positive amount of presentments under the different heads.

Have the goodness to make out the minute and classified detail you have mentioned, and also of the several items under the several heads?—I can furnish the Committee with the precise amount of those presentments under the different heads and also a minute detail of the items under each head.

[*The witness was directed to furnish the same.*]

Martis, 13° *die Maii*, 1823.

SIR ROBERT SHAW, BART.

IN THE CHAIR.

Dr. William Harty, again called in; and Examined.

Dr. William Harty. (13 May.)

HAVE you made an analysis of the assessments of any one year under the several heads already enumerated?—I have.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

TABLE, N° 3.

	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Presentments at sessions - - - -	1807	14	5	1,672	14	5
2. Hospitals and dispensaries - - -	325	–	–	397	9	5
3. Poundage and allowances - - -	1,071	8	7	1,053	11	3
4. Sundry expenses attending trials at commission	193	2	9	151	8	4
5. Coroners for inquests - - - -	48	10	–	45	10	–
6. Roads and Walls - - - - - -	608	16	9	569	17	2
7. Repairs, new works, and rents for the several prisons - - - - - - -	853	7	7	1,364	13	9
8. Food, clothing, bedding, coals, oils, soap and candles, and employment for more than 800 prisoners - - - - - - -	3,128	18	11	3,148	18	7
9. Stationery, advertisements, costs and petty expenses - - - - - - -	291	9	7	382	8	8
10. Medicines, necessaries for sick, &c. and six hospital superintendents - - - -	450	9	5	486	16	2
11. Sixteen principal officers, and 28 inferior officers and servants, &c. - - - -	2,225	15	6	2,309	15	4
12. Instalments, to repay monies borrowed -	1,300	–	–	1,300	–	–
Total - - -	12,304	13	6	12,823	12	1
(Error of 2*s.* 10*d.*) Grand Total - - £.			25,128	5	7	

Have you made a more minute and classified detail of the several items under those heads?—I have under heads 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, which give the items of the preceding analysis.

[*The witness delivered in the same; which were read as follows.*]

Dr. *William Harty.*

(13 May.)

N° 7.—Repairs, &c.	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Ironmongery, bedsteads, painter, glazier, plumber, carpenter, stone-cutter, plasterer, &c. at Newgate - - - - - -	337	16	3	285	14	8
2. Slater, for repairs of Sessions-house, and Green-street prisons - - - - - - -	11	7	6	25	5	6
3. Painting, glazing, papering, whitewashing, carpentry, and smiths work, &c. at Sheriff's prison - - - - - - - -	102	11	2	111	2	3
4. Rent and repairs of Smithfield Penitentiary -	60	14	11	48	12	4
5. Rent and water for Richmond Bridewell* -	39	1	–	39	1	–
6. Ironmongery, paving, slating, masonry, carpentry, plumber, stepping-wheel, &c. at ditto	301	16	9	854	18	–
Total of N° 7 - - - £. 2,218. 1. 4. £.	853	7	7	1,364	13	9

---

* In calculating this item for the Michaelmas Term, it was, by mistake, set down at 39 *l.* 10 *s.* whence an error of 9 *s.* in N° 7 of the Table, p. 35.

N° 8.—Food, Clothing, Employment, &c.	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Newgate:						
Soap, candles, oil, &c. - - - - -	82	3	–	76	7	10
Coals - - - - - - - -	100	–	–	241	13	3
Bread, (total at Easter, with savings, 700 *l.*) -	295	5	3	700	–	–
Potatoes, herrings, milk - - - -	680	5	6	228	17	11
Straw, brushes, mops, buckets, &c. - -	125	–	–	54	–	–
Clothing, (210 suits) blankets, (250 pair) ticks, (200) rugs, (150) sheets, (24 pair) shirts, (200) shifts, (150) - - - - - -	308	–	–	357	15	–
Also, clothing for convicts - - - - -	-		-	58	1	1
2. Smithfield Penitentiary:						
Accommodation and employment - - -	138	13	6	401	10	1
Support of prisoners, (total, with profits and savings 806 *l.* 3 *s.* 11 *d.*) - - - -	141	18	3	224	11	3
3. Richmond Bridewell:						
Accommodation and employment, (exclusive of savings at Michaelmas, 128 *l.* 7 *s.* 1 *d.*) -	669	3	7	618	5	7
Support of prisoners, (exclusive of savings and profits, 1,350 *l.* 9 *s.* 7 *d.*) - - - -	493	14	4	19	5	10
Coals - - - - - - - -	94	15	6	168	10	9
Total of N° 8 - - - £. 6,277. 17. 6. £.	3,128	18	11	3,148	18	7

N° 9.—(Petty Expences, &c.)	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Distributing bread - - - - - -	20	–	–	5	–	–
2. Stationery - - - - - - - -	148	16	11	137	12	4
3. Taxed costs and advertisements - - -	36	11	10	170	4	2
4. Cleansings at Newgate - - - - -	9	10	–	9	12	2
5. Petty expenses in the several gaols - -	56	10	10	60	–	–
6. Inspector general of prisons - - - -	20	–	–	-	-	-
Total of N° 9 - - - £. 673. 18. 6. £.	291	9	7	382	8	8

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

N° 10.—(Medicines, Necessaries, &c.)

	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Apothecary, for advance of money and trouble in providing necessaries - - -	10	–	–	10	–	–
2. Medicines by physician - - - - -	128	19	3	125	9	–
3. Necessaries by ditto - - - - -	29	11	4	29	8	1
4. Medicines by surgeon - - - - -	141	8	8	97	7	11
5. Necessaries by ditto - - - - -	29	11	4	11	15	3
6. *Nurses and hospital superintendants -	82	15	–	112	5	–
7. Meat and milk for sick - - - - -	19	2	2	31	13	1
8. Washing for hospital of Sheriff's prison -	9	1	8	8	17	10
Total of N° 10 - - - £.877. 5. 7. £.	459	9	5	426	16	2

* To this item for the Easter Term there should have been added 40*l.* for two hospital superintendents at Richmond Bridewell, and the same sum in that case should be deducted from the last item charged in N° 11.

N° 11.—(Officers and Servants.)

	Easter.			Michaelmas.		
Grand Jury Officers:	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Secretary to Grand Jury (Alexander Montgomery, Esq.) - - - - - -	75	–	–	75	–	–
2. Treasurer of public money (William Darley, Esq.) - - - - - - - -	150	–	–	150	–	–
3. Public accountant (Daniel Hutton, Esq.) -	75	–	–	75	–	–
General Officers:						
4. Inspector of prisons (Rev. P. R. Gamble) -	200	–	–	200	–	
5. Protestant chaplain (Rev. Thos. Gamble) -	50	–	–	50	–	–
6. Dissenting ditto (Rev. James Horner) - -	50	–	–	50	–	–
7. Roman Catholic ditto (Rev. Lawrence Morrissy) - - - - - - -	50	–	–	50	–	–
8. Physician to prison (Dr. William Harty) -	200	–	–	200	–	–
9. Surgeon to ditto (Alexander Read, Esq. -	113	15	–	113	15	–
10. Architect to ditto (H. A. Baker, Esq.) -	28	8	9	28	8	9
Local Officers:						
11. Gaoler of Newgate (Frederick Bowns, Esq.)	200	–	–	200	–	–
12. Deputy gaoler of ditto (Mr. Robert Gilbert)	100	–	–	100	–	–
13. Six hatchmen at ditto - - - - -	169	–	–	169	–	–
14. Keeper of Smithfield Penitentiary (Mr. J. E. Marston) - - - - - - -	60	–	–	60	–	–
15. Turnkeys and servants at ditto - - -	82	2	–	119	10	3
16. Governor of Richmond Bridewell (Thomas Purdon, Esq.) - - - - - -	200	–	–	200	–	–
17. Deputy governor of ditto (Mr. A. Wilson) -	50	–	–	75	–	–
18. Matron at ditto (Mrs. Frew) - - - -	40	–	–	40	–	–
19. Turnkeys, schoolmasters, taskmasters, servants, &c. - - - - - - -	332	9	9	379	1	4
Total of N° 11 - - - £.4535. 10. 10. £.	2,225	15	6	2,309	15	4

Over which of those heads of expenditure is it that the grand jury possess the greatest discretionary power?—They may be said to possess very little discretionary power, save over the eleventh head, that of officers and servants, and even there their discretion is still limited.

How do you show that to be the case?—If we examine the presentments for any one year we shall find not only that it is imperative on the grand jury to make the presentments, but to make them with little or no control over the actual amount.

Can you give any instances in illustration of that assertion?—I can furnish several: thus, if we take the table of presentments for the year 1822 under the twelve different

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

heads, we shall find that under the first head, the presentments at sessions for that year amounted to 3480 *l.* 8 *s.* 11 *d.*; of that sum there are paid to four officers, for fees remitted, 2801 *l.* 6 *s.* 10 *d.* fees imperative by Act of Parliament, over which the grand jury have no control whatsoever, as specified in the 49th of George III. Then of the remaining sum of 679 *l.* 2 *s.* 1 *d.* there is 150 *l.* for stationery; for rents, for furniture, and glazing, leaving 529 *l.* only at the discretion of the jury to be divided amongst ten officers, none of whom could be dispensed with.

Have they any discretion over N° 1?—None, except so far as has been stated.

N° 2?—None.

N° 3?—None.

N° 4?—None.

N° 5?—None.

Have they any discretion over N° 6?—That degree of discretion merely as to whether the state of the roads and walls required the expenditure.

N°. 7?—The same as N° 6.

N° 8?—It is imperative on them to make presentments for those articles; and their discretion is so strictly limited by the contracts that they must take the lowest contract.

N° 9?—The same; but there is more discretion under that head.

N° 10?—N° 10, the jury must present for the articles under the checks established by law, and by the usage of the court and grand jury.

N° 11?—All the officers and servants must be paid; and the only question is, what should be the amount of remuneration proportioned to the duty discharged.

N° 12?—They have no discretion.

Are there not certain presentments altogether at the discretion of the grand jury?—Strictly speaking, none can be discretionary, because they must be sanctioned by law; but there are a few altogether discretional, for example, the grand jury would not insure any prison against fire, however desirable it might be to do so; but it is left to their discretion whether they will present for a stepping-wheel or fire-engine; whether they will heat the prison by the ordinary means, or by various mechanical contrivances: those are presentments which the grand jury cannot be compelled to make, and though lawful, are strictly discretional.

Have any of the grand jury presentments for special purposes, been, to your knowledge traversed?—Never, to my knowledge, has any presentment been traversed for any special object; the only presentments that have ever been traversed were for arrears alleged to be due by one of the parishes.

That was a question between the parish and the treasurer?—It occurred in the case of the parish of Saint Thomas, and comes specially within my knowledge.

Do you reside in that parish?—I do.

What do you know of that transaction?—When I heard of the presentment being traversed, I went into the vestry-room, and examined the vestry-books, and I found that those proceedings were ordered by a vestry, consisting of three lawyers, three attornies, and one or two ordinary parishioners: a lawyer and attorney were of course employed on the occasion.

Do you know any thing of the petition for St. Thomas's Parish, or had you any concern in forwarding it?—I attended the meeting, that was convened for the purpose of petitioning Parliament; and I can inform the Committee that the attendance was very scanty, that the statements made on the occasion to induce the parish to petition; were exaggerated in the extreme, and most erroneous. I stated many of the errors in that petition, and the cry of the meeting was "divide, divide": I told one or two gentlemen present, for whom I had a regard, that I regretted they should commit themselves and the parish by erroneous statements; and that if they would favour me with half an hour's conversation I would show them many of the gross errors under which they laboured. I met the gentlemen afterwards, and asked them why they did not call upon me: they never sought the information, and the petition went forward in the state in which it is.

From your experience, or knowledge of the manner in which parish business is usually conducted, would you approve of intrusting the parish with more extensive powers?—Certainly I would not.

State your reasons for that.—My reasons are various. In the first place they are general, arising from my knowledge of human nature, and of the state of society in Ireland, where a great majority of its people live up to it, if not beyond their means; and I do not conceive it safe for men in such circumstances to be entrusted with or to have the management of monies not their own. In the next

place

Dr. *William Harty.*

(13 May.)

place, from the very nature of parish-meetings, all such at least as I have attended, I would say that any six or eight persons combining in a parish could regulate that parish, and govern it as they pleased, if they would take the trouble of attending every meeting, and of sitting it out. In the next place, I would object to granting the parishes of Dublin any further powers, from my knowledge of their past and present history. When they had powers, they were grossly abused, in every instance, of which I am prepared to furnish evidence independently of my own; and in the last place, I would specially object, from the knowledge I have of particular facts.

What are those particular facts?—I will state one fact in my own parish, of which I am perfectly cognizant: I would state, generally, that the parishes even abuse the powers, such as they now possess, in the levy of their own cess; that they often cess for illegal objects; and that the parochial money which passes through the hands of the churchwardens is frequently diverted from parochial objects to the purposes of individual interest; and when I make that general assertion, I can give one out of several instances within my knowledge. A late churchwarden in St. Thomas's parish, Counsellor Cullen, (and the reason I give his name specially is, that if I were to allude generally to the churchwardens of that parish, the imputation would be general; they all would feel it; and therefore I particularize the individual, who is a leading parochial reformer, and, if my memory serves me right, was chairman at a late meeting of the parochial deputies, when a member of this Committee now present was formally introduced, and was also the council employed by the parishes to oppose the grand jury presentments (when submitted to the Court of King's Bench in Michaelmas last). Counsellor Cullen, I say, was senior churchwarden, there being two churchwardens to most parishes; and in his last year, on retiring from office, there was a sum of, I understand, about 200 *l.* deficient, and of that sum a considerable portion was due to parish officers. To one of the officers, the vestry-clerk in particular, there was a sum of about 100 *l.* due for two years salary; that vestry-clerk was compelled, under threats of dismissal by the succeeding churchwardens, to accept the personal notes of Counsellor Cullen, at six, twelve, eighteen, and twenty-four months, without discount or interest added, in lieu of the demand which he had on the parish; and I can only state further, that the first of those payments, as it fell due, was not discharged. I must add further, that having heard a rumour of this transaction, I sent for the vestry-clerk, and with great difficulty extracted from him an admission of these facts, under fear of consequences; and, to induce him to tell, I told him, that if any unpleasant consequences ensued, I would take care there should be a proper meeting of the parish to investigate the affair. I could state similar facts of other parishes. A similar occurrence took place in St. George's parish, one of the most respectable parishes in Dublin. I shall only state further, that one of the leading parochial reformers of Dublin in his day, Mr. William Smith, of St. Michan's parish, well known as a public character at all those meetings, was not long since transported for robbing the parish charities.

Was not Mr. William Smith tried for stealing a sum of money from the plate which he was intrusted to hold as a collector in the church, and for which offence he was transported?—He was; and he had been the chairman of the parochial deputies of his day.

Do you know of your own knowledge any other instance of the sort?—I should not wish to state any thing but what I know to a certainty; I have heard of various other instances. I know that the parishes do assess contrary to law; and that it has been only by decided interference that such assessments have been prevented. There is a gentleman, however, in attendance upon the Committee, the vestry-clerk of St. Michan's parish, who has been in that office nearly forty years, and who can state from his own knowledge the practices of that and other parishes when they possessed all the powers they are now seeking.

It is stated in the petition from St. Mary's parish that the expense incurred by that parish alone, for the administration of the criminal law, at present exceeds the whole charge levied from the entire county of Dublin for the same object; and that that single fact is sufficient to show that the charges in every department are unnecessarily heavy, and the salaries to the various officers regulated upon a scale of expense exceeding all reasonable principle of compensation.

Are those assertions correct, or does the inference appear to you reasonable and just?—The committee may form its own opinion, when I state the real facts of the case, and the grounds upon which only a proper inference ought to be drawn, in comparing a parish

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

parish of the city of Dublin with the whole county of Dublin. In the first place, we will take the presentments at Easter term 1822, when the levy on the county for the administration of criminal law amounted to 2,314*l.* 1*s.* 3½*d.* whilst the actual applotment on St. Mary's parish, which is referred to in their report, amounted to 2,356*l.* 8*s.* 11½*d.* about 40*l.* more than the county; there were considerable arrears due by the parish at the same time, which of course should not be included in the estimate: and in making the comparison, it should be recollected that the whole of the applotment on St. Mary's parish embraced all the objects for which there were grand jury presentments; therefore there is no fair ground of comparison in that respect. In the next place, the county of Dublin has but one prison, and the officers necessary for one prison, which contains upon an average about 100 criminal prisoners, some of whom are state prisoners, supported by the government: while the city of Dublin has three criminal prisons, containing, generally, about 800 prisoners; consequently there can be no great wonder that the applotment on St. Mary's parish should be very large, even if it related entirely to criminal matters, as compared with the county; but it is further to be recollected, in instituting any comparison of the kind, that St. Mary's parish is the largest parish in the city, its extent and wealth considerable; and that its applotment is not only greater than that of any other parish, but exceeds the applotment upon eight other parishes taken together: therefore I conceive there is no ground whatever of comparion as between the applotment on that parish, and the applotment on the county of Dublin, and consequently no just inference.

What proportion does St. Mary's parish bear to all the parishes of Dublin?—It exceeds St. Peter's and St. Thomas's parish in its applotment, and St. George's in its extent; consequently I conceive there are no just premises from which to draw an inference; and that, as the facts stand, the inference would be quite the reverse of that which is drawn by the petition of St. Mary's parish.

It is stated in the same petition, as a reason why the taxing powers of the Dublin grand jury should be abolished, and intrusted to parochial commissioners at vestries, that those powers are exercised by the grand jury, almost without control or responsibility; and that it is the practice in Great Britain to intrust such powers to parochial commissioners, or vestries.

How far do you conceive either or both of those assertions correct?—I consider the first utterly groundless, because I think it has been shown already, and may easily be proved, that the taxing powers exercised by the grand jury are exercised under considerable control and responsibility, as they can present for no one object, unless sanctioned by Act of Parliament, and not only sanctioned by Act of Parliament, but in a great majority of instances, the actual amount of presentment is not at their discretion; it is defined by law; and they are under strict responsibility to the court of King's Bench, and that court, I can assert, does exercise great control over them. With respect to the practice in Great Britain, I believe, so far as I have made inquiries, the case to be otherwise than is stated: certainly in the city of London a control and taxing power is exercised in the wards by the alderman and the common council of each ward, so far constituting a species of corporate grand jury within the ward.

The petition of St. Thomas's parish states the present enormous and unjust amount of local taxes, as well as the numberless instances in which they have been abused, to be entirely owing to their being subject to the management of the grand jury, or the corporation of the city of Dublin; would it not therefore contribute to the benefit or relief of the citizens of Dublin if the constitution of its presenting grand juries was modified?—I should think that I have already stated facts sufficient to show that the amount of those taxes, enormous you may call them if you will, is owing to causes entirely independent of the constitution of the body which levies the tax; and therefore having shown the efficient causes of the amount, it cannot possibly be owing to the constitution of the body levying the tax.

Do not you think it would contribute to the satisfaction of the citizens of Dublin if the sheriffs were in the habit of alternately naming a member of the corporation, and a citizen, not a member of the corporation, to serve upon the grand juries?—I am quite confident that it would contribute very much to dispel the ignorance and the prejudices that exist on the subject; and that it would also give considerable satisfaction did the sheriff so act; but at the same time I do not feel the least hesitation in saying, that the result of such a concession would be that, in the course of four, or five or six years, very few respectable citizens would take advantage of the privilege so conceded.

Why would they not?—The respectable citizens of Dublin are persons occupied in trade, commerce, or professions, to which they devote their entire time; the indi-

Dr. *William Harty.* (18 May.)

viduals who busy themselves especially in parish business are persons who have little to do; and I do not call those the respectable class of citizens; the truly respectable citizens, engaged in trade and commerce, would perhaps at first attend on those grand juries, but would soon consider such attendance useless, and, if compulsory, disagreeable.

Do not the corporators pursue business also?—The magistrates are, many of them, persons who have accumulated property, and have retired from business altogether, or who hold official situations under Government; to them specially the care and superintendence of the prisons belongs; and I should consider it highly detrimental to the interest of the prisons of Dublin if there was not on the grand jury a reasonable proportion of the magistrates who are in the habit of constantly visiting the prisons, and thereby are acquainted with their wants and necessities.

Within your knowledge do respectable citizens attend the vestries, to superintend the management of the parochial money as far as that is concerned?—Scarcely ever, within my knowledge.

Those who at present constitute the grand jury, what are they?—They consist of the magistrates, and sheriffs peers, those who have been sheriffs.

Do you call them respectable citizens?—The persons elected to be sheriffs in Dublin must fill a respectable station in the city; they must be men of some property, and in most instances they are men of property.

Are they men of business?—It is not unusual for those gentlemen to retire from business.

Do not you conceive it liable to suspicion the manner of the grand jury giving presentments to members of their own body?—Certainly it is; and I can say that a feeling does exist with a great majority of the citizens, that those presentments are presentments made not so much to meet public wants and public necessities, but as means of jobbing: such a feeling however, in my opinion, is without just foundation.

You do not think it would be advantageous if they were prohibited by law from giving presentments to their own body?—I think no presentments ought to be made to any grand jurors, but in cases where it is necessary for the public benefit.

Then you would make no alteration in the constitution of the grand juries?—With respect to making any alteration in the constitution of the grand juries by positive enactment, I should think that positive abuses ought first to be clearly proved; at the same time, I do not hesitate to say, that it would be satisfactory to the citizens that a recommendation should come from this Committee; and I have little doubt but that a simple recommendation, without imputing abuse, would be attended to by the sheriff, and would not be disagreeable to the magistrates.

Was not that recommendation made last year by this Committee?—A recommendation was made, but not of the character I have described; and if the Committee knew the quarter from whence those assaults came, it would not be surprised that it was the feeling of the grand jury that they would degrade themselves if they then acted on it; but as I have already said, a recommendation coming from this Committee, without imputing abuse, would, I am confident, be attended to; and I can state this fact, in proof of that disposition, that some members of the grand jury did urge on their brethren to request the sheriff to put various persons on the grand jury who were active in attacking the grand jury, and the whole system.

Are the Committee to understand from you that you do not conceive that any alteration in the constitution of the grand juries, which would cause the individuals serving upon the grand juries to be selected, not from the corporation only, but from the citizens at large, would not be productive of any beneficial consequences in economy?—I feel confident it could produce very little, unless by a neglect or sacrifice of the public interests.

Do you think at present there is a fair and open competition in the way of contract under the present constitution of the grand jury, as there would be if the constitution of the grand jury were altered?—I conceive that with respect to contracts there cannot be a doubt on the question, the preference being uniformly and of necessity given to the lowest bidder.

Do you think that if at the ensuing assizes a contract were advertised for by the grand jury of the county of Dublin, and also by the grand jury of the city of Dublin, the contract would be concluded upon as advantageous terms for the public in the city as in the county?—That must altogether depend upon the terms of the contract offered.

Do you conceive there would be as many proposals for the city contract as for the county contract?—I have no means of forming a judgment from any knowledge of those contracts which are offered by the county grand jury; but this I know, and every

Dr. William Harty. (13 May.)

every person must know that if he offers at a rate lower than another he must get the preference.

Is it possible that by any favour or management the contracts should be given to any except the lowest bidder?—I conceive that it is impossible from the steps that are taken, first in public advertisements, secondly from the manner in which they are submitted to the grand jury. To render such an occurrence possible, the whole grand jury must be consenting to a gross departure from their duty; and though the corporation of Dublin may happen on some questions to act as one individual, there are contending interests in that corporation, and there would be the same of course on the grand jury; it would be necessary therefore to such an end, and yet scarcely possible, that all should be consenting to a gross departure from their duty.

Are not the contracts read in court?—They are submitted to the court, and examined.

Have you ever known an instance of a contract proposed to a grand jury in the city of Dublin, the proposer not being a member of the grand jury, which has been rejected in favour of a higher contract made for the same article, either by a member of the grand jury, or a member of the corporation?—I have never known such an instance, nor do I believe it; but on the contrary, I know one decided instance in which a member of the corporation was thrown out from the supply of bread for the prisons by a Catholic baker bidding under him by a small fraction.

Can you suggest any way in which greater publicity could be given to the contracts?—I do not know how greater publicity can be given than by advertising them in the Dublin papers.

A sufficiently long time before?—Always three or four weeks. It is never usual to advertise during the sitting of the grand jury, but they did so once to get contracts for potatoes, when they had had no tenders.

You know of no abuse, nor do you think any abuses exist in the distribution of those contracts?—Certainly I know of none; and I do conceive the system is in that respect as little liable to abuse as any human institution so far can be.

The following extract was read from the Report of the Inspectors General for 1823.

Medical Department of the Dublin Prisons.

"We have formed a very unfavourable opinion of the existing regulations, affecting this department in all its branches, with respect to the attendance, the accounts, and supply of medicines, but we are not at present prepared to recommend any measures for the improvement of the system. We hope to submit some observations to Government upon that subject prior to our report of next year."

Have you read that extract?—I read it within the last hour for the first time.

Here is another extract from the same report, respecting the fiftieth section of the 50th of Geo. 2. which regulates the qualification and appointment of surgeon, physician, and apothecary of the prisons in Dublin, viz. "Dr. Harty and Surgeon Read are the medical officers, and the duty is efficiently performed." It goes on in the 51st section, which regulates the attendance in the prisons, and states that that regulation is complied with; also the necessity of making weekly returns is complied with: the 55th regulates the appointment of the apothecary, and states that his attendance is to be had when necessary: the 56th, 57th, and 58th sections regulate the supply of medicines by the apothecary, and the observations upon those sections are "the medicines are supplied by the apothecary, and duly vouched at each assizes or terms." You have heard these extracts read, how can you account for the contradiction which appears in the general report upon the medical department, and the special answers that are given to different sections relating to that medical department?—I should rather think it is for the Inspectors General to account for the difference between their general and special reports; but I do not hesitate to say that the very unfavourable opinion given by the Inspectors General against this department in all its branches, with respect to the attendance, the accounts, and supply of medicines, is utterly groundless, and contrary, in my judgment, not only to their own special report, but is altogether opposed to all my knowledge and experience in the department.

Who is the apothecary of the Dublin prisons?—The firm of Craven and Nichols.

How long have they been so, and what is their professional character?—They were the apothecaries to the prisons long previous to my appointment in 1812, and their professional character is undoubtedly of the highest description.

Do

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

Do either of them attend you on your visits to the prisons?—Never, and that decidedly at my own request, it would be attended with no advantage to the sick, but would be a source of great inconvenience to all parties.

The law prescribes that he should attend?—It does; but it is utterly impossible to comply with it unless it be regulated that the surgeon and physician should never attend at the same time at any two of five different prisons.

Does the apothecary ever attend the prisons?—The apothecary was required, when the new inspectors general came into office, to attend and sign his name; one of the firm having been confined by illness, the other, an elderly gentleman, was compelled in all weathers, under the fear of consequences, to walk to all the prisons, (for he cannot ride or drive) and he was obliged to do so merely for the purpose of writing his name in the attendance book: in consequence of which I remonstrated with one of the inspectors general, and he said, under the view that I gave him of the subject, that they would dispense with his attendance.

In point of fact, are both those gentlemen apothecaries to the prisons?—They formed one firm about two or three years since; originally there was only one apothecary, Mr. Craven: now it is the firm of Craven and Nichols.

Is the attendance of the apothecary ever performed by a deputy?—So far as regards their attendance on the physician and surgeon it is dispensed with.

Does the apothecary or ony one on his behalf attend the prison?—Unquestionably, whenever necessary or useful.

Then if it were expedient to require his attendance, where would be the difficulty of one of the members of the firm attending the physician, and the other or his deputy attending the surgeon?—There would be no difficulty so far, but the clause was framed in ignorance of the necessity; and this disadvantage would arise from a useless compliance with the law, that the physician and surgeon should have stated days and hours for visiting, and thereby prevent the possibility of detecting any abuse in their hospitals.

You are aware that it is positively enjoined by the law?—I am quite aware of it.

By what authority has it been dispensed with?—From its inutility and the impossibility of acting upon it.

Do you mean generally?—With respect to that enactment only: I do not mean with respect to other enactments regarding the prisons.

Is he punctual and expeditious in making up your prescriptions?—The discharge of his duty in that respect is most strict and regular: there are five prisons to be attended by the physician and surgeon, so that it may happen, if I visited at twelve o'clock, and my prescriptions of course ready, that the superintendent cannot leave the place till he ascertains whether the surgeon will come: the prescription of course must lie over till three or four o'clock: but whenever a case of any urgency occurs, it is always attended to without delay.

Are the apothecaries appointed annually by the grand jury?—They are appointed, like the other officers, by the grand jury, approved of by the court, and removable by the court.

Were those apothecaries capable of doing their duty at the time of their appointment, from their state of health?—Unquestionably; one of them is a young man, lately attacked by illness, but now convalescent.

It appears by your statement of the warrants for 1822, that the whole medical and surgical charge, exclusive of salaries to the physician and surgeon, amounts to 917*l.* 5*s.* 7*d.*: how much of that charge is for medicines or for necessaries, and how much for hospital nurses and superintendents?—For medicines the amount was 493*l.* 4*s.* 10*d.*; for necessaries supplied to the sick, 100*l.* 6*s.*; for special articles of food, 50*l.* 15*s.* 3*d.*; for washing, 17*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*; and for the payment of six hospital superintendents (three males and three females), 234*l.*

Can you tell the Committee the average number of prisoners in that year?—The Committee will recollect that the apothecary's charges and the attendance of medical officers relate to all the prisons; the constant number of residents in which in that and preceding years was between nine and ten hundred, nearer to one thousand than nine hundred; but it adds very much to the number of the sick, and of course to the labour of the officers, and the expenditure on medicine, that it is not a stationary population of one thousand persons, but a shifting one of four thousand.

You stated that you have three male and three female superintendents?—Yes.

Having five prisons under your charge, how do you happen to have only three male and three female superintendents?—There are in Newgate two male superintendents, one for the surgeon's and the other for the physician's department, their

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

hospitals being quite distinct and in separate parts of the prison; in the Richmond bridewell there is also a male superintendent; and in the sheriff's prison, the city marshalsea, and the Richmond bridewell, there is one female in each. In the Smithfield penitentiary the duty has been hitherto done by the keeper's wife, the number of sick confined to bed being there very few.

What charges are included under the head of necessaries for the sick?—There were certain heavy charges included under this head so lately as the year 1820, which are not now included: I will first detail to the Committee all the charges that were made before that time, and will then specify the charges that are now omitted: these are, meat, milk, porter, wine, flannel, shoes and stockings (of the cheapest description), flummery and oatmeal, tea and sugar, lemons and oranges, hospital furniture, and straw for the beds, bathing machines, soap and candles, coals for the hospitals, payments made to messengers and to prisoners, selected on account of their good conduct, to aid and assist in some of the hospitals requiring that aid; all surgical instruments, such as splints, bandages, crutches, trusses, and other instruments required by the surgeon for his patients; pens, ink, paper, hospital books; washing for certain departments; the payment of female midwives, and when necessary, the payment of male accoucheurs, when the females were inadequate, and that has been occasionally a source of some expense; there is also the supplying of razors, scissors, towels, &c. and every thing necessary for hospitals; and besides I find included under this head the payments made in Easter term 1819, and in Michaelmas 1821, for taxing the apothecary's bill by order of the Court of King's Bench: I should add, that of the foregoing articles, meat, milk, coals and candles, are no longer supplied by the apothecary, to his great satisfaction.

Do you conceive that a reference to Apothecaries Hall is any practicable way of judging?—I have no doubt they do exercise a more impartial judgment than is conceived, from a feeling for the credit of their tribunal.

If there were a supply of medicines laid in at the public expense in the prison, and some practical officer paid for the management of that, do you or do you not think that a very considerable saving might be introduced in this department?—I would say, that taking into consideration the state of the five prisons of Dublin, separated as they are, and at such distances, that an arrangement of that sort would be a source of little or no saving to the public; and that I think will appear when I explain to the Committee the nature of the apothecary's charges, and the extent of sickness that prevails in the prisons; such a change might be a source of economy and of convenience if there was but one great prison where the apothecary was resident, and where the supply of medicines might be kept; under such circumstances, it might be a source of convenience and economy, but to have medicines in every establishment, to have the same apothecary travelling from one to another and making up the medicines in each, the payments to be made, and the accommodation given to such an officer, and the expense of maintaining the different establishments, would I should think, rather increase than diminish the charge.

The charge for medicines would appear enormous when compared with that of other similar establishments, for example, in that of the county of Dublin; can you explain the cause of the difference?—I think I can satisfactorily.

Can you state the facts first with regard to the Dublin gaol?—In the county gaol there is one medical attendant, a surgeon; he receives a salary of 80*l.* a year; the medicines are supplied by an apothecary, and I dare say they seldom vary more than from twenty to thirty pounds in a year, seldom so much as thirty; but the reason of the difference in that respect between the county and city is simply this, that the county prison is placed out of the town, is extensive and commodious, compared with the amount of its prisoners, seldom one hundred in number, some of whom (the state prisoners) are supplied by government, there being a distinct officer for those prisoners: but the material point is this, that the prisoners committed to the county gaol are, almost without exception, vigorous healthy subjects, and I can state from my own knowledge, having attended the city convicts at Kilmainham during the prevalence of fever; that even then and at other times, there were scarcely any sick in Kilmainham; and I would say, considering all these things, that the charge for medicines amounts to a very reasonable sum in a prison where virtually there is little or no sickness; whereas in the gaol of Newgate alone, without reference to the other four, you have a population crowded to excess in an incommodious prison, a population consisting of the very dregs of the lowest orders in Dublin, female prostitutes, who are the great thieves in Dublin, almost all of them diseased; there are infirm old people, and many especially of lowest class, who are constantly in a state

Dr.
William Harty.
(13 May.)

state of ill health or are most liable to contract disease; they are unable to remain in their cells, and they are confined in yards, in which during a great part of the year, the rays of the sun never enter; it is only on the state side that the sun shines; in the other departments they are during many months of the year in cold damp yards, with deficient clothing, constantly exposed to all the causes of illness by which human nature can be affected.

Can you inform the Committee what is the per centage upon the number of prisoners, that is, the average number of sick; having stated the average number of prisoners in the Dublin prisons as being one thousand?—The inspector having returned to me a number of my weekly reports, I have them here for examination, and from them I took three winter months and three summer months, to strike an average.

In what year?—In this last year; I took the months of December, January and February last, and June, July and August last; from those returns I can state the number of intern and extern patients.

Can you give in such a statement to the Committee?—The number of interns in the hospital of Newgate in the three winter months were 167, and 112 externs, the average of interns 14, and of externs 9 and one-third; putting out of consideration entirely; an immense number of prisoners who receive medicines, but none of whom are entered in those returns, unless actually prescribed for in the book, there being always in the prison pills and other articles.

[*The witness was directed to send in a return of the average number of sick in the different prisons.*]

Can you explain why such a number of sick are relieved at Mercer's hospital in Dublin, at so so cheap a rate, compared with Newgate and other prisons?—I think I can; Mercer's hospital and all the hospitals keep dispensaries open in the mornings for the poor; and in their returns of the number of patients in a year, they enter every person applying each morning, so that if the same person came twenty times twenty different mornings, he appears so often as a new patient; and I can state on the authority of surgeons that attend that hospital, that a great proportion of those patients, are persons that come for, perhaps, some slight surgical operation, and who receive no medicine whatever.

Your observation applies to external patients entirely?—It does; with respect to the internal patients, there is an apothecary who makes up the medicines; and with respect to surgical patients, those who are acquainted with the hospitals know that they do not require, nor do they receive the same proportion of medicines as the medical.

Do your observations apply to the Cork-street fever hospital?—Certainly not.

Would the reasons you have given, account for the difference that appears between the expense of the Richmond bridewell and Newgate, compared with the expense of the sick in Mercer's hospital; for it appears that the expense for the sick according to your statement, amounted to 917*l.* whilst in Mercer's hospital, the number of intern patients in 1820, was 516, and the externs 1,896; and that the whole expense for medicines for that hospital amounted to 320 *l.* in one year; will the reasons you have just given account for that enormous difference?—In the first place, the Committee will be pleased to distinguish what is actually the expense incurred for Richmond bridewell, as the question includes the whole medical and surgical expense and necessaries for the sick in the last year. I directed the apothecary to supply me with an exact copy of the presentment which he sent in at this last Easter term, and in that the expense for Richmond bridewell for medicines is 42*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.* In calculating the expenditure, either at Mercer's hospital or at the Cork-street fever hospital or elsewhere, you are to add to the expense for medicines, the charges for supporting and providing the apothecary; and unless we have the facts as regards the payments made to those officers, it is impossible to make any accurate comparison.

But the 320*l.* which has been expended in one year in Mercer's hospital embraces both medicines and salaries?—I would say again, that the comparison should be strictly between medical patients and medical patients, for I have stated that a vast proportion of the number so set down are surgical patients, that perhaps did not receive any medicine at all, or if they did, it is only a dose of salts, or some cheap medicine of that sort. With respect to those who do receive medicines, any person who is acquainted with the mode of proceeding at those hospitals, well knows that the value of the article is very small indeed.

But those observations do not apply to the Cork-street house of recovery, how can you account for the great disproportion between the expense of the Cork-street

D.
William Harty.
(13 May.)

hospital and the prisons of Dublin?—Not having the data before me, I cannot now answer the question.

Is not the attendance at this hospital performed gratuitously?—Certainly not; originally it was, because the funds of the hospital did not then admit of remuneration, and physicians would not refuse to act gratuitously did a public charity require it.

What is the rate of charge made by the apothecary, is it fixed or is it variable?—I can submit to the Committee a table showing his rate of charges, compared with the ordinary charges of Dublin, as made by apothecaries against the general description of patients; and I will specify a few, in order that the Committee may judge of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of his charges. When pills are ordered to a certain amount, say twelve, the ordinary charges for twelve pills is 2*s.* 2*d.*, and that was the charge made by the apothecary in former years; the charge made by the apothecary at present and of late years is 9*d.* only; and where the ordinary charge is 2*s.* 6*d.* he charges only 1*s*; for a blister, either to the chest or to the back, for which the ordinary charge is from 2*s.* 2*d.* to 4*s.* 4*d.* his charge is but 1*s.* 4*d.*

Are the charges usually in the same proportion?—All the charges are in the same proportion; considerably less in general than one-half.

Can you show by references to former years, that the apothecary's charges are considerably decreased?—I can state by reference to former years, that when the number of sick must have been not one-fourth of the present amount, the medical charges often exceeded 300 *l.* a year; as for example, in the year 1807 they amounted to 415 *l.*; and in the year 1788, when there were very few prisoners, they amounted to 209 *l.*

What are the checks in passing the presentments for the apothecary?—In the first place the apothecary on delivering his account makes an affidavit in these words under the head of medicines, he swears: I, *A. B.*, apothecary of the said city, do make oath that the aforegoing articles and medicines amounting to pounds were furnished by me, and so on, and that they were genuine; he swears as to the genuineness and the rate of charge made by him; and with respect to necessaries he makes oath that he has actually expended the sum for necessaries ordered for the patients in the different gaols, and that the charges are what he paid; the only remuneration that he receives for the advance of his money is 20*l.* a year allowed him by the statute. Besides his own oath, his accounts regularly come before me, and they cannot be laid before the grand jury without a voucher on my part as to the articles being ordered, and also with respect to the prices, and as to the amount. When I was putting up my papers I met with an account of the apothecary's, the whole of which he was obliged to alter merely in consequence of a certificate of mine at the foot of it, showing the accuracy with which the whole is checked.

[*The witness produced the account to the Committee.*]

Does not Mr. Craven, as a grand juror, assist in passing his own accounts?—Mr. Craven did in former years act as a grand juror; but to my knowledge he has not been on the grand jury for several years.

Can you show any check exercised by the grand jury on the apothecary's accounts?—They have spoken to me, even when he himself has been on the jury, about the nature and amount of his charges, and the court, as has been already mentioned, has sent his bills to be taxed; I will venture to say there has been a greater facility in passing his accounts since he ceased to be a grand juror than before.

Do you entertain any objection to contracting with an apothecary for the supplying of the Dublin prisons with medicines at so much per year?—Undoubtedly I should, because I feel quite confident that no person could offer fairly to contract for the prisons except a person who was in the habit of supplying them, and who therefore knew the amount of supply; and that any person who offered at a certain rate to supply the prisons, would pay himself by adulterated medicines; and I can assert, that the satisfactory mode in which I have been able to conduct the medical department, consists greatly in the confidence of always having genuine medicines, a circumstance which has contributed not a little to the prevention of mortality in the prisons. I never knew an instance in which I have supposed that the articles were not genuine.

Are you on very intimate terms with the apothecary?—I must know him well, but

Dr. *William Harty.*

(13 May.)

but I am not at all on what would be considered intimate terms with him; I never dined with him in private, nor he with me.

Are you under any obligations to him for favours such as physicians may receive from apothecaries?—I can say that I never received through his recommendation a single shilling, to my knowledge or belief.

Have your prescriptions ever been influenced by a desire to increase his emolument?—My habit, unfortunately perhaps for myself, is to prescribe for the patient and not for the apothecary; and in this case I could have no motive to act otherwise.

Are you aware of any special reason for the loud clamour that exists against the apothecary?—I have some reason to know that it is promoted by persons desirous of getting his situation.

How often are you required by law to attend the prisons?—Twice a-week at least at each prison, and oftener if necessary; the gaol of Newgate alone compels me on an average, and the calculation is made from the attendance book, to attend at least between three and four times a-week: in many cases I have been called to attend six times a-week.

Are you called upon to attend at unseasonable hours?—Often.

Is your duty liable to any great occasional increase?—It has at times been liable to a great increase, so that I have been obliged to attend six or seven times in the week, at Newgate more especially.

Have you any other duty to discharge besides attending the sick?—I have to attend to examine the prisoners before trial, and to examine all convicts before they are sent on board ship; to make weekly reports to the inspector, and to certify the health of any prisoners when required by Government.

Are you consulted respecting the dietary and clothing of the prisoners?—With respect to the clothing I am not, although I have interfered occasionally in directing additional clothing; but with respect to the dietary, I have been always consulted; I believe always, except on the last changes.

Are the prisoners in the habit of complaining to you on those and other subjects?—Whenever they have had cause of complaint; they have complained to me when provision of any kind happened to be bad, and other officers were not in the way, and they have always been redressed. The case, however, is not of frequent occurrence.

Can you state the number of beds appropriated for the sick of the different prisons, distinguishing the medical from the surgical cases?—The number of beds appropriated to the medical patients in four of the prisons amounts to 44. In the Smithfield penitentiary there is no distinct hospital, but when there are sick there are always beds provided; there are for the surgeon 24 beds, but generally there were in the majority of those, two in a bed, which I never permit; and when the hospitals are over-crowded, I always direct the gaoler to furnish the sick with cells.

Are they ever empty?—The only hospitals that are ever empty, and that is only occasionally, are the hospitals of the city, marshalsea and the sheriff's prison; the others are constantly occupied, not always full, but they are constantly occupied. I have made out the weekly average number of males and females in them, which I will specify in the return I am required to make.

Will you state the total or the average mortality of the five Dublin prisons, during the period in which you have known it?—The calculation I made on that subject was made under circumstances which I hope may place it above suspicion, either as to the weekly number of the sick or the mortality; it was a table that I formed in giving an account of the prevalence of the epidemic fever in Ireland, and the different prisons: that table states from the year 1812 to 1819; I have added to it the three subsequent years.

[*The witness delivered in the same.*]

What are the chief sources of trouble and loss of time in the discharge of your official duties; do they arise from the number of prisons, from the amount of sick, or the character of the sickness?—The trouble is greatly aggravated by the number of prisons that it is necessary to attend; some of them being at remote and inconvenient distances: a further source of trouble is the constant number of sick in each, and that trouble at times is not to be estimated so much by the number of the sick, as by the severity and acuteness of some of the cases. A single case might require me to attend every day in the week, when forty common cases might only require me to attend twice a week.

What do you calculate to be the weekly average of your duty, and the amount of

Dr. *William Harty.*

(13 May.)

of compensation?—To give a general view of the duty I am under the necessity of performing, I will, for the sake of illustration, consider the five prisons as one, and place it at a general average distance: in such a case, I would say that I must visit that one prison twelve times at least in a week, that I have to prescribe for about 70 sick, and that I do not receive for that duty one guinea per day.

You have stated that there are five prisons in Dublin; in what street are Newgate, the sheriff's prison, and the city marshalsea?—They are the only prisons that are at all convenient in their situation; they lie all together in Green-street.

Is there much more difficulty in attending those three prisons than there would be in attending one prison that covered the same space?—There undoubtedly is: in Newgate I have to visit the male department on one side, I must then have various doors opened to visit the female apartments on the other side, and frequently to go through different cells.

In point of fact, are they altogether in Green-street?—They are, yet all as distinct buildings.

How far is the Smithfield penitentiary from those three prisons, how long does it take you to walk?—I never measured the time; but I should suppose, considerably more than half a mile.

Do you pass through more that one street?—It is all one street, but a very long street, and it is in a part of the town where there is very little other professional business to transact.

Prior to the establishment of the Richmond bridewell, was there not a bridewell in Dublin?—There was an old bridewell in James's-street.

It was the duty of the physician to attend it?—Yes, but I had little or no duty to discharge there.

Still it was the duty of the physician to attend four prisons?—It was.

Are you not much better paid than the medical attendant on the London prisons, who has to provide medicines?—The medical attendant on Newgate and Giltspur-street Compter, is a surgeon and apothecary; of course, a lower class in the profession than than that of a physician, and he receives 500*l.* a year for discharging that duty, and he provides his medicines; but I can undertake to say that he has very little to do.

He attends Newgate, Giltspur-street Compter and the Borough Compter?—Yes, and his own apprentices attend generally the latter: the two former lie together and are in his immediate neighbourhood.

Have you visited any other prisons?—I have visited all those prisons, and the Whitecross-street prison, and the Milbank penitentiary.

Will you state what are the medical expenses of the prison at Horsemonger-lane?—I have not visited or inquired with respect to any but those I have named.

Have you visited the Milbank penitentiary?—I have.

Can you state the medical expenses there?—From the official reports I perceive that the resident surgeon receives 400*l.* a year, though there are besides other medical attendants, whose remuneration is not stated.

Can you state what the expenses for medicines are?—I cannot.

The expenses for medicine at the Milbank penitentiary in one year were 98*l.* 14*s.* only, whilst the average number of convicts amounted to 747, how do you account for the extraordinary disproportion between that expense for medicines and the expense in the Dublin prisons?—Very easily; that charge is for drugs only, not including the expense of preparation; there is besides but little sickness comparatively, from the manner in which the prisoners are accommodated, and from the state of cleanliness and comfort they enjoy, and from their being of a different and superior class to the Dublin prisoners. It is also to be calculated, that the Dublin apothecaries are under the necessity of employing two additional hands, in consequence of being apothecaries to the prisons; because they have not only to make up the prescriptions, but frequently to bleed, or to perform some other operations in each of five prisons at considerable distances from their habitations.

How far are the most distant prisons from each other?—The distance between Smithfield penitentiary and Richmond bridewell is at least between two and three English miles; the whole town lies between them.

Is there any reason why you should be better paid than the physicians who attend the fever hospital in Dublin?—I think so; one is a charitable institution, the other is a public establishment, in which there is a very disagreeable duty to

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

perform; and there is character to be made by attending the fever hospital, but it is rather the reverse with respect to the prisons.

Do you mean to state that your extensive practice in the prisons is not serviceable to you?—Certainly not, I consider it as detrimental; and I do not hesitate to say, that if at the time of my election I had my choice of being physician to the gaol, or physician to the fever hospital, I should have chosen the fever hospital; and I can strengthen the statement by stating the fact, that a physician who some time since was attached to that hospital, and who has occasionally discharged my duty during my absence, declares that no consideration on earth would induce him to attend the prisons.

Could you derive any emolument from any abuse of the official trust reposed in you?—Certainly; no transport can be removed on board without the sanction of my authority; in consequence of which I have been repeatedly offered very considerable bribes to keep back particular transports: these offers have only ceased from having been never accepted.

Do you derive any other emoluments from the prisons besides your salary?—None whatever.

What is your rule of conduct in case of certificates being required of you by prisoners?—I uniformly refuse certifying for any prisoner (except a mere pauper) at his own request, but require an order from government; and I uniformly refuse even the regular fees for attendance on prisoners unquestionably well able to pay any physician or surgeon.

What is the line of demarkation distinguishing the medical from the surgical patients?—All the venereal patients are placed under surgical care; of course all accidents and generally all external diseases unattended by fever or internal disease.

Why was not the salary of the surgeon raised as well as that of the physician and inspector?—At the time the salary of the physician and inspector was raised the then surgeon was an old man, and confined by ill health: his duty was discharged by deputy, and under those circumstances there was no application to the grand jury.

Is not the duty attached to the office of surgeon as great as that attached to the physician?—It is very heavy, and in some respects the same as regards the necessity of regular attendance at the different prisons; the number of his patients is always considerable, not so great as the medical, nor liable to such variations in point of number; but it is always considerable.

Do you conceive that surgical patients are more likely to be common in the prisons of Dublin than in the county prison?—Certainly, the prostitutes of Dublin being most generally thieves also.

Could either his office or yours be dispensed with without serious injury to the health of the prisoners?—From the multitude of sick that necessarily come into or are to be found in the prisons, it is very evident that there must be a number of cases to which only the physician could be competent, and many others to which only the surgeon could be competent; and it is for the Committee under such circumstances to decide whether, at a time when most expensive enactments have been enforced for promoting the comforts and morals of prisons, they would adopt a regulation that could produce a very small saving to the public, and which would contribute greatly to aggravate the state of disease in the prisons. Before a physician was appointed the prisons of Dublin were always scenes of great wretchedness and disease.

Will you state the check that is exercised over the medical officers?—They must enter their names in the attendance book on each visit.

Does not the Act prescribe something beyond the mere writing of the name?—The duty discharged should be stated also.

Is there any memorandum made in the book of the duty discharged?—Generally there is, but our duty can be merely that of visiting the sick.

Do you think from your experience, that the gaol of Newgate is a convenient and commodious gaol?—I think it quite impossible that, without a new and commodious prison, the city of Dublin can be in that state in which it ought to be, with respect to the management of its criminal prisoners; indeed there must be a considerable annual increase of criminals unless a new gaol be built, the present being "worse than useless."

If a new gaol was built, do you think that the city of Dublin ought to pay the whole expense of it?—If the county prisoners are to be accommodated in the city gaol, as at present, it appears to me but reasonable and just that the county should bear its proportion of the expense; but if a new gaol be not built, I am quite satisfied

Dr. *William Harty.*

(13 May.)

fied that if the government wish to check crime in Dublin, they will so far alter the law as to send the county prisoners to Kilmainham, where there is good accommodation and means of classification.

Do you not think that the removal of the prisoners under conviction, would have the effect of considerably reducing the number?—It would somewhat, but not so much as to enable the officers to classify even the committed prisoners.

What measures would you propose for checking the increase of criminal prisoners in Dublin?—Before I propose any measure of that kind, I should first state to the Committee my views of the causes which have produced the increase of crime in Dublin: and I should think that the returns before the Committee will satisfactorily explain those causes. There are returns before the Committee of the committals to Kilmainham and to Newgate from 1805 to 1821, and from those it appears that for four years previous to the Act of the 48th of the King, which sent the county prisoners to the city gaol, the number in the latter scarcely ever exceeded 700: on the passing of that Act, the number at once rose to upwards of 900; and the Committee will perceive on turning to the county returns, that, as the number increased in the city, it diminished in the county. In the year 1807 the number was 254, and in the three following years 195, 161 and 128, then they continued nearly stationary in Newgate and in the county prison until the year 1815. When the peace took place, followed by an immediate and general want of employment, then the number rose at once in the city from 986 to 1,372, and they continued at that rate till the effects of the scarcity of 1816 was felt at Dublin in 1817, and then they rose at once to 2,000, and have continued at that rate in consequence of the bad state of Newgate, the influence of bad example, the demoralization of every person committed there, the want of employment, of education, and other causes: it is not so much crime, as the number of criminals that has increased, and especially among juvenile delinquents. The causes now assigned are borne out by returns from the county, and by returns from the whole of Ireland, which rose nearly in the same proportion at the different periods, referred to.

Do you mean to say that the increase of crime in the city of Dublin has been exactly in the same proportion as the increase of crime in the county of Dublin and in Ireland generally?—I mean that the causes I have stated as the causes of the increase in Dublin evidently produced a similar increase in Dublin county and in the whole of Ireland: for example, after the peace the number of criminals rose in Dublin from 986 to 1,372; in the county they rose from 166 to 215, and to 300 the next year; and in the country at large in 1815 the committals were 5,792, and in 1816, on the occurrence of scarcity, they rose at once to 11,273. These, therefore, are obvious causes, so far, to account for the number of criminals in Dublin; and I conceive that number is kept up by the state of Newgate, and in some degree also, I would say, from the comforts enjoyed in the prisons beyond the comforts which the poor in Ireland can enjoy; and I would also attribute something to the influence of the female criminals, who, instead of being transported, are sent to prison for two, three, or four years, at a great expense to Dublin, to the subsequent corruption of the young.

The proportionate increase of crime in Dublin appearing to be less than the proportionate increase of crime in Ireland, as well as the particular increase of crime in the county of Dublin, how do you account for the difference?—We cannot expect an exact proportion to exist in the increase of crime in different places, though it may be owing to the same general causes. I conceive there were general causes operating, but of course they will operate with different degrees of influence in different places; and I think the returns before the Committee will bear me out in these points.

Do you think the institution of the Mendicity Society diminished the number of criminals?—Unquestionably it diminished the number of female prisoners.

How many classes of officers of the grand jury are there paid by presentment?—There are three classes of officers: the grand jury officers, the general officers, and the local officers of the prisons.

From your knowledge of the remuneration made to public officers in similar departments elsewhere, do you consider that any of those Dublin officers are excessively remunerated for their trouble and professional assistance?—From every inquiry I could make, from the returns I have seen, and from my knowledge of the very extensive duties which those officers have to discharge, I do not consider any of them over-paid, and some of them are certainly under-paid; for example, the treasurer, whose duties and responsibility are heavy, the inspector of accounts, whose salary is quite

Dr
William Harty.
(13 May)

quite disproportioned to his trust, the protestant chaplain, whose case is peculiarly deserving of consideration, and also the keeper of Smithfield penitentiary, whose labours and great merits entitle him to additional compensation.

Do you consider the payments to the clerks of the peace as being disproportionate?—The payments made to the clerks of the peace are not at all at the discretion of the grand jury; they consist of fees regulated by Act of Parliament. I speak only of those officers who are paid by direct presentments from the grand jury, the amount of which is at their discretion.

It appearing by the Act to which you have referred that the grand jury are directed to present any sum not exceeding such amount, do you consider that the grand jury have not a discretion to present such legal amount as they shall think fit and proper?—If it be only specified that the sums are not to exceed a certain amount, they certainly would appear to have some discretion; but it has never been usual to exercise it when a table of fees is so fixed by law.

Are those officers removable by the Court of King's Bench?—They are all removable by summary process for neglect or misconduct, with the exception of the gaolers, who are not removable by the court as they are in England.

Are you acquainted with the duties and emoluments of the secretary to the grand jury, if so, will you state them?—I have made myself acquainted with those duties, and can state that he has to attend the grand juries during their sittings four times in each year, and every day of sitting at least four hours on each day; he has to summon every jury, he has to summon the special committees, and all persons that are to attend before them; he has to record all their proceedings, to examine and prepare all their presentments, and to keep an office open to the public during term, and both before and after term, for all persons applying for information; he has also to furnish various returns, and for these duties he receives a salary of 150 *l.* a year.

Do you conceive the secretary to be responsible to the grand jury for the legality of every presentment laid before them?—He always vouches for it; and when necessary, he always makes an investigation; and when the inquiry is made, he vouches whether he has examined it or not.

Are you aware whether that is the mode taken at present to ascertain the legality of the presentments?—If we compare one presentment sheet with another, it will appear upon examination that there are not perhaps ten presentments in one different from the other: therefore the grand jury must by usage be well acquainted with the legality of the various presentments.

What other emoluments does he receive?—He receives for his trouble, in the collection of the Anna Liffey and in the wide-street tax, for both together 100 *l.* half-yearly.

Making 350 *l.* in all?—Yes.

How do you account for the compensation to those officers on account of the Anna Liffey tax continuing after the tax ceased?—After the tax ceased there were arrears to be collected, and all accounts to be made up and checked, and in doing that there was more trouble than there would have been in merely going on with the regular collection of the tax, and so long as that trouble continued the presentment continued, and when that trouble ceased the presentment ceased with it.

Were there not in former years arrears to be collected, independent of the current levy?—No doubt; but all accounts had to be accurately examined, so as to finally close the account; and I can state, on the authority of the officers, that the trouble was much greater than if the tax had been continued.

Then you have no other information but what you derive from the officers?—None, and the fact that the presentment did unquestionably cease last year.

What are the duties and compensations made to the treasurer?—The treasurer receives a salary, as treasurer of public money, of 300 *l.* a year, and for that he must give security to the amount of 20,000 *l.*: he has very complicated duties to discharge.

He is not allowed any use of public money?—He cannot retain the public money in his hands for thirty-six hours; he receives his monies regularly on Saturday, and when the accounts are closed, at 3 o'clock on Saturday, he sends to the bank to deposit the receipts.

Do you not conceive that, on any revision of the local taxation of the city of Dublin, it would be a great improvement to concentrate all the receipts of all the taxes in one office, and to allow the promptitude of any person in paying to entitle him

Dr. [illegible]

([illegible])

him to an allowance in the way of discount?—Unquestionably, it would be a most desirable arrangement, and one most satisfactory, to have certain offices for the collection of all the local taxes; but with respect to the allowance of discount, it is a proposal that would be merely calculated to take the money from the payee out one pocket and return it into the other; for in order to allow discount you must increase the amount of the tax by the amount of the proposed discount; and it just comes to this, that you must lay on the more to make up for it; for example, in the grand jury cess, if the sum to be raised be 25,000 *l.* that sum is to be raised for special purposes; and to enable you to allow a discount to persons paying this money you must lay on an additional tax, perhaps of 2,000 *l.*

Do you not conceive that there would be very considerable saving to the public, infinitely more than five per-cent, if there were a ready-money dealing established by the several contractors?—Certainly; there would be very great saving.

Then if you enable the individuals who are to contribute to the grand jury taxes to pay in advance, would not the advantage of establishing a fund for ready-money dealing be thereby attained? and would not the gain to the public, by a ready-money dealing, be more than the five per-cent allowed to the individual paying it?—Unquestionably.

Do you conceive that the Secretary and the Treasurer, either jointly or separately, might not discharge the duties of the public accountant?—The duties of the public accountant are of vast importance; there are such a number of complicated presentments and accounts coming before the grand jury; and the whole of that duty is to be discharged within the short period of the term. If the Treasurer or Secretary were called upon to discharge that duty, it is impossible they could discharge their own efficiently; and I am quite sure the public would be a serious loser; and I can further state, that the public accountant has saved more in a term than the whole amount of his salary.

You will bear in mind that the question was, whether the Secretary and the Treasurer might not be equal to the public discharge of those duties?—The duty of each is specially heavy at the same period. If it was a duty to be discharged at any other time than term time it might be done, but as the case is otherwise it cannot be done.

Are you aware of any losses which have accrued to the public through the grand jury collectors?—I never heard of any; for I can state that the grand jury take care to have proper security from the collectors, and then they uniformly call upon the securities to pay any deficiencies of the collectors.

Have you any knowledge of the circumstances which occurred in the Court of King's Bench last term with regard to a traverse?—I have mentioned that it was a traverse not for any special presentment, but for arrears alleged to be due by one parish; it was merely a traverse for arrears.

Are you aware of the Treasurer at last Easter Term having sent the presentment sheet to the churchwardens of St. Mary's parish only on the seventh day after it was fiated, and that no traverse after it was fiated could be made after the expiration of seven days?—I am not aware of such a circumstance.

Do you keep a copy of the orders which you give to the apothecary?—They remain in the prescription-book.

Are there any medicines or necessaries furnished by the apothecary without your control or that of the surgeon?—Certainly never, except in a case of this kind. I always leave with the superintendent certain medicines, purging pills, or purging mixtures, and if a sudden attack comes on, and those should not be at hand, the superintendent would send for them to the apothecary.

Do you by your prescription-book check the amount of the apothecary's bills?—Certainly.

Do you conceive the charge on the whole to be fair and reasonable?—I consider it very reasonable indeed.

Are you aware what he charges for wine?—I think it is 2 *s.* 4 *d.* a pint for port or sherry; and to show the further reasonableness of his charges, I shall only state this fact, that the operation of bleeding is a source of considerable trouble to the apothecary; the charge used to be 5 *s.*, and when it had been reduced even to half-a-crown, I remonstrated with him upon the unreasonableness of charging half-a-crown for bleeding five patients, perhaps in the same prison and on the same day; and I suggested the propriety of making a general charge, he said he would rather strike out the whole charge, and has done so ever since.

Do

Dr. William Harty.

(13 May.)

Do the sick under your charge of the Roman Catholic persuasion, receive religious aid from the Roman Catholic chaplain of the prison?—In some of the prisons they do, and in some others not.

Pray why is it that they do not?—It is owing to an impression, I believe, made on some of the prisoners that he is not a regular or proper priest, and under that feeling I have sometimes suggested to the governor to allow another to come into the prison (the Richmond Bridewell); and when a patient was very ill or dying, I did not conceive it would be right not to allow it, and have always obtained the concurrence of the governor to allow another clergyman to visit that person.

Is it the general impression among the prisoners at Newgate, that Mr. Morrissy is a suspended priest, and therefore not qualified to administer the rites?—I believe it is.

Then in the cases to which you have alluded, you refer exclusively to extreme cases of illness?—Yes.

In which cases only another priest is allowed?—These are the only cases in which a request has been made to me by the prisoners.

Will you state the circumstances attending Mr. Morrissy's appointment?—The appointment of Mr. Morrissy is connected with a long train of circumstances growing out of the act which first enabled the grand jury to present for a Catholic clergyman; the grand jury then appointed the Catholic clergyman who had been in the habit of discharging the duty gratuitously; his name was the Rev. Mr. Murphy, now dead; when he was appointed at a salary he was interdicted.

Did you ever hear the grounds of the interdict?—The grounds of the interdict must evidently appear to consist in the perhaps natural desire of the Roman Catholic bishop to secure the emoluments of the office for the clergyman of the parish, leading to an unpleasant contest between the Catholic archbishop and the grand jury, as to the virtual right of appointment; the grand jury in asserting their right, evinced no partiality, for they appointed the person who had been in the habit of discharging the duty gratuitously, and without their knowledge.

Are you aware that there is any obstacle to the administration of the rites of the Roman Catholic church in any one way, by any minister who does not belong to that parish?—Certainly, without the concurrence of the officiating clergyman; the same thing occurs in the Protestant church, but there is a dilemma on both sides as between the law and the canons of the Roman Catholic church: the law required that the same chaplain shall perform the duty in all the prisons, though they were not all in the same parish.

By the law of the land as it now exists, the Roman Catholic priest of the parish should be appointed?—Yes, that is now the law.

Therefore the law of the land is in concurrence with the supposed regulation?—No doubt; but then the question arises, shall the grand jury therefore turn out their present officer whose moral character has never been impeached, and who has requested me to lay before the Committee various certificates of his strict moral character. I shall only further say that every effort has been made on the part of the grand jury and of the sheriffs to appoint a clergyman who shall be approved of by the archbishop, but could never succeed. One of the sheriffs being ordered by the court to appoint, wrote to Dr. Troy, requesting the names of eight clergymen whom he should approve of, and that he would appoint one of them: the archbishop declined doing so, and would merely recommend one, whom of course the sheriff would not nominate, because he would thereby relinquish the right of election: he accordingly nominated several respectable clergymen, but they were no sooner appointed than interdicted. Hence it became a struggle whether the grand jury or the Catholic archbishop should have the right of nomination, and under those circumstances the grand jury finding it impossible to get persons who would be approved of by the archbishop, nominated Mr. Morrissy, who has diligently discharged his duties for more than two years.

But this difficulty is not one that is liable to recur, the law having decided the case in concurrence with the general practice?—No doubt; and it would have been better had it been always so.

Have the parochial committees applied to you for any information on the subject of the medical department of the prisons?—No, nor to the inspector, or the apothecary, and if they had applied to me before the publication of their reports I should have been very ready to give them any information.

Mercurii, 14° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

William Harty, M. D. again called in; and delivered in certain documents, which were read as follows:

Dr. *William Harty.*
(14 May.)

Weekly average of medical and surgical patients in the different gaols of Dublin during a given time, embracing the three winter and summer months of 1822.

Weekly average of Sick under care of the Physician.

	INTERNS.		EXTERNS.	
	Winter Quarter.	Summer Quarter.	Winter Quarter.	Summer Quarter.
Newgate - - - -	14	13	9½	10
Richmond bridewell - -	13	10	14½	12
Sheriff's prison - - -	2	1	6	2
City Marshalsea - -	3	2	5	4
Smithfield penitentiary -	3	1	5	2
Total Interns - -	35	27	40	30
Total Externs - -	40	30		
Total - - -	75	57		

N. B.—There were many other externs whose names do not appear on the face of the prescription book.

The return of surgical patients, includes Newgate and Richmond bridewell only, and gives for these three summer months of 1822, a weekly average for both prisons, of 26, of whom about one tenth were externs."

" Weekly average of medical patients in the several prisons of Dublin, during a period of eleven years, together with the total annual mortality.

YEAR	Weekly average of Sick.	TOTAL Deaths.	Mortality in each Prison during the same period.	
- - 1812 - -	20	3		
- - 1813 - -	25	5	Newgate - - - -	35
- - 1814 - -	28	2	City Marshalsea - - -	11
- - 1815 - -	33	7	Sheriff's prison - - -	17
- 1816 - -	40	12	Richmond bridewell - -	6
- - 1817 - -	50	4	Smithfield Penitentiary - -	1
- - 1818 - -	55	6		
- - 1819 - -	50	9	Total deaths - - -	70
- - 1820 - -	60	6		
- - 1821 - -	65	8	Giving an average annual mortality in all the prisons of about 6⅓.	
- - 1822 - -	74	8		

" Made in obedience to the order of the Committee. *W H.*"

Those are prepared by you?—They are.

You believe them to be accurate?—I do.

When you spoke of the local circumstances, which in your opinion occasioned the additional malady in the prisons of Dublin; did you wish to apply that part of your observations to the Richmond bridewell?—Certainly, except so far as situation is concerned, they apply to the Richmond bridewell, because its inmates are composed of the same class of prisoners that had previously been in Newgate.

Dr. *William Harty.*

(14 May.)

But there is nothing in the situation of Richmond bridewell that can produce disease?—Certainly not; but there is much disease among the females particularly, from their previous ill health, their long terms of confinement and reluctance to take exercise.

What are the presentments made for the sheriff's prison?—The presentments made for the sheriff's prison, include all the necessary repairs of the prison; painting, glazing, whitewashing, carpentering and all such items; the total expense of which, in the year 1822, amounted to between two and three hundred pounds.

Is there any presentment for the keeper?—There is not.

Who is the present keeper?—The present keeper is Mr. William Wood.

On what appointment, and how is he paid?—The keeper is always appointed by the sheriffs, and the securities are renewed every year; the payment of the keeper has always arisen from fees which are allowed by law on the discharge of prisoners, and from the rents of rooms, regulated by the court of King's Bench.

What is the state of that prison, compared with its former state?—Nothing could possibly have been worse than its former state; and with respect to the general condition, and the state of its morals, every abuse that could exist in a prison prevailed there, and abuses that could scarcely be credited; but since Mr. Wood's appointment every one, I may say, of those abuses has been corrected, so far as the actual nature of his appointment, and of the existing regulations, would allow.

Were any attempts made to reform it?—Every effort that the inspector could make, within the scope of his power, had been made to reform it, but his reiterated representations and remonstrances were made in vain; until at length the late sheriffs were induced to dismiss the keeper, in consequence of ex-officio informations having been ordered by the late attorney general at my instance, under affidavits from the inspector and myself, and also others which I procured from prisoners, stating the prevalence of gross abuses.

Was it the duty of the inspector to interfere?—Certainly, as far as the law would allow him, but even the sheriffs themselves could, generally speaking, do little, for they held their office for a year only; they knew little, perhaps, of the abuses of the prison till they were going out of office, and if they wished to make a change, they must make it at considerable risk to themselves, the keeper being obliged to give security to the amount of 20,000 *l.* for the safe custody of his prisoners.

Do you know whether any pecuniary compensation has been made by the present keeper for his appointment to the gaol?—I have every reason to know that none was made by him.

Have you heard of such a circumstance in former instances?—I have.

Do you believe it to have taken place?—I do.

Did you ever hear the amount that was imposed?—I believe it was an annual present of about 100 *l.* to the under-sheriff; I believe the fact is on record.

Can the sheriff of each year change the keeper?—Under the existing law he can turn out the keeper at any time; the risk is to the sheriff, and of course the appointment is and should be to the sheriff.

In the returns made to Parliament, it appears that the emoluments of the keeper have varied from seven to nine hundred pounds a year or more; have those emoluments declined, and from whence are they derived?—In the first place, the emoluments had been considerable from the operation of the Insolvent Act, but I believe that a great portion of the income arose from the abuses that were practised in the prison; and under those circumstances, both from an abolition of the fees, the uncertainty of rents, and the cessation of abuses, the income of the present keeper is perfectly insignificant, and inadequate to his decent support and that of a family.

What have been the emoluments of the present keeper, and what are his expenses?—His emoluments for the first half year of his office, in January last, did not exceed 104 *l.*; I mean his net profits, for out of the income of the prison he has to pay his hatchmen, servants and agents, in removing the prisoners to the Insolvent Court, a source of considerable expense, for which no allowance is made him, though there is an allowance for the same object made to the keeper of the Debtor's Prison in London.

Has he a house for his family?—No, he has but one bed-room, and a sitting room or office, common to every person coming into the prison.

Did he give any security for his office?—To the amount of 20,000 *l.*

Can

Dr. *William Harty.*

(14 May.)

Can he enforce payment of rent of his rooms; could he seize the furniture of the debtors?—He can only be secure of his rent by requiring payment in advance, for if a person does not pay him, his only redress is turning him out of that room; as he cannot seize his furniture or detain for rent.

Is the present mode of payment any hindrance to the establishment of good discipline?—Unquestionably; and it degrades the keeper.

From your experience and attention, both to the state of this prison and others, what regulations would you propose to substitute?—The regulation which I would propose, is one sanctioned by the approbation of those most conversant with the state of the prison, and best acquainted with the abuses that existed in it; I would suggest that the keeper should receive, by presentment or otherwise, an adequate salary, independent of all fees and rents, and that the latter should be appropriated to the repairs of the prison, and to the providing proper accommodation for all pauper debtors; that there should be wards for the gratuitous accommodation of those who could not, or would not pay a rent; that any prisoner able to pay rent, and desirous of a separate room, should have apartments at rents regulated, as they now are, by the court of King's Bench; that the amount of this rent should go in lieu of the presentments now made by the grand jury, for the repairs of the prisons, so that the keeper being freed from all concern in rents, and having an independent salary, may be enabled to enforce discipline as it ought to be enforced.

Would you relieve debtors altogether from the payment of rent?—Unquestionably I would not; all such debtors, as cannot pay rent, ought to be accommodated, and might easily be accommodated much better than they are now in the sheriff's prison; but from my knowledge of that gaol, and of other gaols, I never would allow a debtor, who is able to live, and live sumptuously, as they often do, to live free of rent, and be thereby enabled to indulge his appetite the more liberally.

Do not you think, that it would be a fair line of distinction to draw, that all debtors who are supported at public expense, or who receive no assistance from their friends, should in that case be free from the charge of rent?—Unquestionably I would allow every debtor, who pleaded his inability, to be fed and lodged at the public expense; my meaning is, that where there are rooms appropriated to pauper debtors, if a prisoner says he is unable to pay rent, he may go to the pauper rooms, and if he requires better accommodation, he must pay for it.

Would not such a regulation entail a good deal of additional expense upon the city of Dublin?—Certainly very little, for it will be observed, that the presentments now made for this prison, amount to between two and three hundred pounds a year, so that a little additional expense would give an adequate salary to the keeper, and leave the rents in lieu of former presentments. I do not hesitate to say, that such a change, as that proposed, could not be purchased at too dear a rate, as it was almost impossible for any man who ever entered that prison under the former keepers, and abided in it for a season, to come out uninjured in health and morals.

Have you visited the Whitecross-street prison in London?—I have.

Will you state the salary of the keeper of that prison, and the manner in which he is established in the prison?—He has an excellent house in the prison; he has been lately appointed, and is on trial only; his salary on trial is 500 *l.* a year; if he gives satisfaction it will be raised to 800 *l.*

What regulations exist in that prison as to the rent for rooms?—There is no rent whatever charged to any class of prisoners for rooms, they are all common, but there were, besides those common apartments where all are lodged, what were very properly designated in the prison, partial rooms, small apartments connected with each corridor, in which the keeper or magistrates have at times accommodated particular prisoners; but it was a source of such jealousy and complaint, that the keeper suggested to the magistrates, the propriety of shutting up the rooms entirely; they are now closed, so that there are now no partial rooms, to the great annoyance and distress of some, in consequence of the prisoners not being allowed to pay rent.

Is there any inspection in those prisons?—By the sheriff's and magistrates of London.

Do you conceive that appointing superintending committees to control the prisons, would produce the same effect in the city of Dublin, which it does in other parts of Ireland?—I am confident they would be useful; but the committees of the grand jury, as they are at present constituted, being the magistrates, do, as such, interfere;

Dr. *William Harty.* (14 May.)

interfere; but I believe any body respectably constituted and exercising such powers would be useful.

You are aware that persons not being magistrates or grand jurors, may be appointed members of those committees?—I am not aware.

Do you conceive that provision would be a useful provision to extend to the city of Dublin, as well as to all other parts of Ireland, enabling the grand jury to appoint a committee out of such persons as they think likely to discharge the duties well?—I see no objection, certainly.

Are not insolvent debtors, convicted of fraud, confined in the sheriff's prison in Dublin?—They are.

Is not that, in your opinion, a great inconvenience?—It contributes to add to the population of the prison, and it also contributes to degrade that moral feeling which should be sedulously cultivated, in allowing insolvent debtors to mix with common debtors, and under that impression, they ought in my judgment, to be separated from the ordinary debtors, and stigmatized by confinement elsewhere.

You have spoken of the increase of crime in Dublin, have you referred to the increase of convictions or of committals only?—Of committals only; in Dublin it is more an increase of criminals than of crime.

If we were to measure the increase of crime, do you not conceive that the convictions would be a better scale to look to than the committals?—Perhaps, if I were to form an estimate by England it would, but not by Ireland; because I am confident that many persons escape from the apathy and indifference of prosecutors, or from the difficulty of procuring witnesses, which is not the case in England.

That would apply equally to all parts of the scale; it would apply equally in the year 1790 as in the year 1820; if you wish, therefore, to measure crime, do not you consider it would be a better mode to look at the convictions only?—Certainly.

From your experience of the prisons in Dublin, have you any reason to imagine that the number of persons committed, have increased from want of consideration in the committals?—I should think not; I believe the magistrates are more strict in committals now, than ever they had been formerly.

Do you conceive that the provisions of the law are carried into effect in Newgate during your experience, so far as the state of accommodation would permit?—Certainly; the strict observance of the law in Newgate has been increasing of late years.

Are you aware of any peculiar deviation from the law which has taken place in Newgate during your knowledge?—I am not aware of any special violation, in fact it is impossible, in a prison so constituted, with free ingress and egress, that there should be a strict observance of the law.

There could be no difficulty in the observance of that provision of the law which prohibits the removal of criminals to the debtors side?—None, certainly.

Has that provision of the law been complied with?—I believe it has not been complied with.

Are you aware that the criminal prisoners, who were removed from the criminal to the debtor side, or who upon their committals were placed amongst the debtors, were charged the fees for that accommodation?—I believe nothing more than rent.

To whom did that emolument go?—To the gaoler; those however are now entirely abolished; there are no rents or fees.

Up to the period at which, by legislative interference, those fees and rent were abolished, was it not at the option of the gaoler to place criminals at the debtor's side, and to charge them rent for the accommodation which he so gave?—Certainly it was, but always made the check of the inspector and of the magistrates, and I have known the magistrates on their visits direct that certain persons, who were perhaps persons of higher stations in life than the ordinary felons, and therefore admitted to the debtors side, should be sent among the common felons; I have known some very old criminal prisoners put into those apartments because it would have destroyed their health to remain among the common felons.

Have you known many cases of criminals placed on the debtors side?—I have known some, but there could not be many, the apartments were very few, and generally occupied by the debtors.

In those cases in which they did take place they were a positive violation of the law?—Certainly.

Are you aware whether, upon the statement of those cases to the inspector, or the magistrates,

Dr. *William Harty.* (14 May.)

magistrates, that in every instance, or most frequently, the provisions of the law were carried into effect?—I am not aware of any great number of instances, it was only as medical attendant that I was called on to visit those persons when sick, and then it was that I became cognizant of the circumstance, but I am aware of several cases in which the inspector and magistrates did interfere.

In collecting the information which you have laid before the Committee, with regard to the grand jury cess, to whom did you apply in order to procure it?—I had a great number of the grand jury warrants, and I obtained access to the grand jury warrants of my own parish, and also to the grand jury books and other documents.

When did you obtain access to the grand jury books?—In the secretary's office, he being present.

Did you apply to the treasurer for any information on the subject?—I conceived that in his office all the warrants as far back as I could desire to search, ought to be, and I found on inquiring of him, that when he was appointed all the papers belonging to his predecessor were sealed up and lodged in an office of the court of King's Bench.

What was the period of his appointment?—I think in 1807 or 1808.

You found no difficulty on application to those public officers, in obtaining from them all the information they could give on the subject?—Certainly not, so far as they had the means of affording it.

Do you conceive that the class of persons committed to prisons in Dublin are more liable to disease than those committed to prisons in London?—Certainly.

On what grounds do you form that opinion?—First, their hospitals here had scarcely a single patient, and I observed very generally in going through Newgate and the Giltspur-street compter that a great proportion of the prisoners are what I would call, a much better class of prisoners; they are younger and more healthy, there are few of the old and infirm people there that are in Dublin, and they were accommodated in a way very different from what they are in Dublin gaol; in our Newgate they have cells, in the London prisons they have apartments larger or smaller, beds or bedding laid down at night and taken up in the morning, so that they occupy very often the same room in the day that they did at night; the prisoners in Newgate in Dublin are lodged during the day in very good cells, they are turned out of those cells at a certain hour of the morning, and are crammed together in a wretched kitchen, without shoes and stockings, or exposed in the yards to every inclemency of the weather that can create disease, and we know that it is the character of Irishmen, not to regard the weather; in the London gaol they are on boards, and in the Dublin gaol on flags; poverty and want of employment, I consider the chief causes producing the great mass of criminal prisoners in Dublin,

What is the state of the city marshalsea?—It is, in one respect, utterly incompetent to accommodate the persons committed, there being but one apartment for pauper debtors. That room is a good room so far, but is quite unequal to the accommodation of the numbers confined there; so much so, that the magistrates, to my great annoyance, have often ordered the most respectable among the pauper debtors into the hospital apartment. The other rooms for the accommodation of debtors, are just as good as in the sheriff's prison; but the pauper room is utterly incompetent to contain the number confined there. With respect to the yards of the prison, they are much better than in Newgate, or in the sheriff's prison. Additional rooms for accommodating the pauper debtors could be built there without any inconvenience, leaving abundance of space for exercise. To accommodate the pauper debtors properly, a sum of 500*l.* or at most 1,000*l.* expended on the erection of additional rooms, would make it a good prison.

Do you conceive, that the same objections would apply to improved systems of vestry, upon the plan of the select vestries in England, as apply to the present vestries?—The objections which I make to vestries and parochial government, are both general and particular. I think, as I stated yesterday, that, from the state of society in Ireland, from the number of persons in the middle class of life, who are the persons likely to interfere in vestries, living up to, or beyond their means, I should be unwilling to place the public money under their management.

Do you not conceive, that some interference, with regard to the constitution of vestries, is necessary, even with regard to the parish cess, which they at present administer?—I think very great improvements would be necessary: if there was in Ireland any portion of that public spirit which would lead the respectable inhabitants

Dr. William Harty.
(14 May.)

to attend vestries as in England, they might work well; but I never saw, except in extraordinary cases, a good attendance in my parish; the most affluent and respectable parishioners seldom appeared; but there were a few who always attended and conducted the business of the parish just as they pleased.

Do you not conceive the vestry system would be very much improved, if the management and control of the parish funds were entrusted to the respectable inhabitants?—I think it would undoubtedly improve the management of parish business.

Do you not conceive, that the attendance of respectable individuals may be impeded by the attendance of other persons?—Certainly.

If that improvement in the vestry system took place, that would make them, according to your opinion, more efficient in the administration of the parish duties; do you conceive, that they would be ineligible bodies to have some control over the general taxation of the city?—I think, that it might possibly be well managed; but with respect to the selection of the individuals, if it went by election in the parish, I should decidedly object, because I am confident that those persons would be elected who canvassed, and that the respectable parishioners would not condescend to such a course; therefore, unless they were specially named by the legislature, I would most decidedly object, because otherwise there would be no chance of selecting the most respectable members of the parish.

Are you acquainted with the management of local taxes in any other of the great cities of Ireland?—I am not.

Do you conceive, that commissioners who might be appointed by the authority of parliament, and vacancies to be supplied by election, giving the power of electing any persons of a certain station and property, would not constitute a proper tribunal for the administration of the local taxes of the city?—It might be a proper tribunal for such purpose, but still how is the recommendation of fit and proper persons to reach parliament; how can parliament know them, except through the special recommendation of some individuals; therefore it must be a matter of uncertainty, whether fair, impartial and independent men would be elected. Still I think, that, in any case, the same class of abuses, and the only class that can be designated as such by this Committee, would prevail, namely, that every body of men entrusted with power, would give a preference to their own relatives or friends in the appointment to offices.

The duties with regard to which the grand jury are intrusted with power, are duties extending over the whole year, are they not?—The duties of their officers are permanent and constant.

Do you not conceive there is a great inconvenience in placing those powers of control in bodies, who only meet twice in a year?—The control I consider permanent; because a control exists with the court of King's Bench, to interfere at all times by summary jurisdiction.

The grand jury have no power of control the instant their functions cease?—Yes; but the sessions grand jury almost constantly sits, and the term grand jury at each of the four terms.

The sessions grand jury have no control over the acts of the term grand jury?—None; but they can, and do interfere with the prisons and the officers.

Have you known many instances in which the court of King's Bench has interfered effectually in the control or administration of the grand jury funds?—The court of King's Bench, to my knowledge, (for I have been present in court) devote a considerable portion of time to the examination of presentments; the duty is generally discharged by the junior judge, and sometimes two will sit; two did sit on one occasion for nearly three hours, when every presentment submitted by the grand jury was canvassed by the parish council; the result of which minute and unexpected inquiry, was highly to the credit of the grand jury, and the disappointment of the parishes.

There is no other control then except that investigation?—The expenditure of the whole must afterwards be strictly accounted for.

Mr. Samuel Wray, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Samuel Wray.

WHAT is your occupation?—I am vestry clerk of the parish of St. Michan in Dublin.

How long have you held that office?—More than thirty-six years.

Had you any connection with the parish, or knowledge of that parish, before your

Mr. Samuel Wray.

(14 May.)

your own appointment?—I had; because my father had been vestry clerk before me.

Do your official duties necessarily make you acquainted with all the transactions of that parish?—They do; I attend all the parochial meetings, and I enter the minutes of their transactions.

Do you recollect the state of the parish of St. Michan, before the year 1793?—I do.

What power did the parishes then possess of taxing themselves, and for what purposes did they tax themselves?—The parishes had the power of taxing themselves for the watchmen, the lamp lights, and the grand jury cess; that cess was imposed by the grand jury, and applotted and collected by the parishioners themselves.

Had they the management of the paving?—No, I think not; nor had they any control over it within my memory. They managed the parish cess, and they had the appointing of the collectors of those different cesses which I have mentioned.

How were those powers usually exercised, were they generally liable to abuse?—They were generally liable to abuse.

Did the parish collectors on many occasions prove defaulters?—They did.

Were their securities made answerable to the full amount?—In some cases not; I recollect an instance of a collector, who was deficient in his accounts of almost all the taxes that I mentioned; I mean the grand jury cess, the watch cess, and some others; and the parishioners in vestry agreed to accept from his bail, 50*l.* in lieu of the entire deficiency.

What was the amount of the debt due by St. Michan's parish to the grand jury, when the Act of 1793 came into force?—The amount of the debt due by St. Michan's parish, when the collection of the grand jury cess was taken out of their hands was 1,363*l.* 18*s.* 0¾*d.*

What was the amount of the Easter applotment on your parish, under the first warrant from the grand jury, after the passing of the Act in 1793?—1,265*l.* 12*s.* 1½*d.*

What is now the usual amount of the half year's applotment on your parish, under the grand jury cess?—On an average, generally between seven and eight hundred pounds.

Do you conceive, that in the present mode of collecting the money, by collectors appointed by the grand jury, that there is less likelihood of defalcation than under the old system?—I think there is, most assuredly.

Do you know any circumstances besides what you have stated, which would lead you to conclude that the parishes are not likely to manage the public money for the public benefit?—I am of opinion that the parishes are not likely to manage the public money for the public benefit, in consequence of my knowledge of the mismanagement which they practised formerly, when they had the management of the public money; the watch of the city of Dublin was very inefficient; the persons appointed directors of the watch and the collectors of the cesses which I mentioned, generally obtained those situations by canvassing among the lower orders of the parishioners; some of the directors were old men who had retired from business, and they were unable, in the opinion of many persons, and in my opinion, to perform the duty of directors of the watch: the constables were frequently old and infirm persons, and very unfit to be constables, and the watchmen were very often their servants, who worked for them during the day, and acted as watchmen during the night; the parochial watch was so inefficient that the streets of Dublin were very unsafe, they were also very badly lighted; one could scarce go out after sunset without danger of being robbed in the streets.

Did you know Mr. William Smith, of your parish?—I did.

Was he not chairman of the parochial deputies?—He was.

When you state that Mr William Smith was chairman of the parochial deputies, to what parochial deputies do you allude?—Deputies appointed by different parishes, to prepare a petition to Parliament concerning the window tax.

Then the deputies to whom you refer, are not the deputies who have now prepared petitions to Parliament, respecting the grand jury taxes of the city?—Certainly not.

Was not Mr. Smith transported?—He was.

State the reasons of it?—It was for felony, which he committed in the church, having robbed the poor at a charity sermon.

What was his general character previously to that discovery?—It was that of a man always complaining about government and taxation.

Was

Mr. Samuel Wray.

(14 May.)

Was he reckoned a dishonest man?—He was reckoned dishonest, but there had been nothing till that discovery, proved against him; he was only suspected.

The observations you have made respecting the vestries, refer to the vestries as at present constituted in the city of Dublin?—Yes, part of the observations I have made, refer to present and past vestries.

Then if the vestries were formed of men of greater independence of circumstances, in the higher walks of life, to be selected by some proper authority, your observations would not apply to such vestries as that?—I think, from the experience I have had, that respectable men in the higher walks of life would not accept of such situations, the situations I mean of directors of watch and members of committees, who are generally in Dublin men who are not in the higher walks of life, though the vestries appoint them.

The question referred to the vestries themselves; if the vestries themselves were appointed from individuals of a better class and of higher station in society, and more independent in fortune, the objections you have made to the present vestries, which are composed of persons of the lower description, would not apply?—It is not to the vestries, but to the persons appointed by vestries to manage the public money heretofore, that I alluded.

Do you not conceive that a better description of persons would be appointed to manage the public money if the vestries themselves were better appointed?—Yes.

Do you know of any defalcation in the public money in any of the churchwardens of your parish at any time?—I do not.

Have you ever heard of any in any of the other parishes?—I have.

Do you know of it in any other parish?—Not of my own knowledge.

Is the attendance at the vestries of the parish of St. Michan's generally composed of persons in the more elevated situations in life?—The majority of such vestries, in every parish, must be persons of a lower class, as they are the more numerous class; the richest and most respectable class seldom attend.

Was any thing proved against Mr. Smith, in the course of his examination, as to any misconduct, previous to that upon which he was tried?—There was no charge brought against him for any thing else; when I say that he had not a good character previous to that trial, I mean that the parishioners of his own parish entertained suspicions that he applied money, which he had received for the relief of the poor, to his own purposes.

Mr. Smith, or his character, have no relation to the present parish deputies, or the proceedings which they have taken?—I believe not.

Do you not know that Mr. Smith's proceedings bore altogether upon the question of the repeal of the window tax?—I believe they did.

If there had been any suspicion of Mr. Smith before, do you think he would have been appointed chairman of that committee of deputies?—It is very likely that those persons who appointed him did not hear of the suspicion entertained of him.

Mr. Molesworth Greene, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Molesworth Greene.

WHAT situation do you fill in the city of Dublin, under which you receive any remuneration by presentment?—I am joint clerk of the peace of the city of Dublin.

That is the return which you make to parliament of the duties and emoluments of your office as clerk of the peace, (*a document being handed to the witness.*)?—It is.

Have the goodness to state from that return, what the emoluments of your office were in the several years from 1815 to 1821?—In the year 1815, the amount was 1,864*l.* 6*s.* 7*d.*; in the year 1816, 1,741*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.*; in the year 1817, 1,825*l.* 17*s.* 2*d.*; in 1818, 2,145*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.*; in 1819, 1,855*l.* 5*s.* 5*d.*; in 1820, 1,808*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; and in 1821, 1,901*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.*

Will you turn to the schedule of 1822, and state the different items in that charge for the year 1822, and the subsequent years?—The first is under the 23 and 24 of the late king in lieu of fees on persons tried and acquitted, 189*l.* 12*s.* 8*d.*

Will you turn to the items under the authority of the 48 of George the 3d.?—The 48 of George 3, is in lieu of fees on prisoners tried and acquitted in one year 200*l.*

Will you state what distinction there is between those two heads; they both appear in the returns to be the same; will you refer to the 23d and 24th of George the 3d?—The 23d and 24th of George the 3d, volume 12, page 689, empowers the sessions

Mr. Molesworth Greene.

(14 May.)

grand jury to present in lieu of fees of clerks of the peace, sheriffs and gaoler on prisoners tried and acquitted. N. B. This Act has been repealed so far as relates to the sheriffs and gaoler, and the clerks of the peace are presented under it every quarter, the sum of 39 *l.* 12 *s.* 8 *d.*

By what grand jury is that presented?—By the sessions; we receive no other presentments from any grand jury but one, and that is for making a return to government.

The presentment made under the 48th George 3, is imperative upon the grand jury, and is, in addition to the presentments to which the clerk of the peace is entitled, under the 23d and 24th of George 3d, is that so?—Precisely so; it has been the practice of some of the clerks of the peace in Ireland, under the table of fees, to charge for each indictment sent to the grand jury, but we have never charged in any instance for more than one, no matter how many the prisoners happen to be convicted upon.

Do you consider the Act of the 49th of the King, to apply to the city of Dublin, or to warrant any presentment being made under or by virtue of its authority?—Certainly I do; and such was the opinion of His Majesty's attorney-general that it was; for the grand jury upon one occasion several years ago, were more active in searching into our presentments, and upon that occasion I laid a number of abstracts of all the Acts of Parliament before Mr. Saurin, and he gave his opinion, which has regulated the grand jury ever since.

Will you turn to the 3d section of that Act; is not that the section which authorizes presentments by the grand juries for fees in lieu of those persons who shall be discharged without fees?—The marginal note says, "Grand juries to present for fees in "lieu of such persons as shall be discharged without fees;" and there is one thing which shows that this must be an Act relating to all clerks of the peace throughout Ireland, because there is a schedule of *all the fees of all the clerks of the peace in all Ireland.*

With regard to this clause, which gives the power to the grand jury to present, does it state whether it is the term grand jury, or the sessions grand juries, or the juries at assizes?—I think the conclusion of that clause removes any doubt about it.

Does it state term grand juries, or sessions grand juries, or the grand juries at assizes?—No, it does not.

There is nothing in the enacting part which says, that the sessions grand jury can present?—I think the recital of the Act before it begins with the enacting part, affords a very strong presumption.

In that section authorizing presentments, is there any mention made of sessions or of term grand juries?—No; but the 49th of the King is made referable to the city and county of Dublin and sessions in each, by 50th of the King, sec. 85, chap. 103, in these words, 49 George 3, as to fees on criminal prosecutions *extended* to Dublin county and city.

Then there is no provision authorizing the presentment under that section, which applies to sessions grand juries or term grand juries; it is strictly limited to grand juries of assize?—We are entitled, under the list of fees attached to and forming part of the Act, in common with every other clerk of the peace; that is directed to be posted in the office of all the clerks of the peace.

Will you point out any expression by which you conceive that that section authorizes the grand juries of the city of Dublin to present for fees?—The very title of the Act I should submit, with very great respect, is a strong evidence.

Did you take the opinion of the attorney general of Ireland upon that Act?—I think I did.

Have you a copy of that opinion?—I have not here.

What do you conceive to be the rate of fees referred to by the 23 and 24 of George 3; what is the rate of those fees?—It is here; formerly we were presented 50 *l.* and out of that 50 *l.* the sheriffs and gaoler were entitled to a proportion, and 39 *l.* 12 *s.* 8 *d.* remained of the 50 *l.* to us.

Is that taken at the gross charge, or is there any schedule of fees to which you refer?—This Act has been repealed so far as relates to the sheriffs and gaoler, but remains operative as to the clerks of the peace, and they are presented under it a sum of 39 *l.* 12 *s.* 8 *d.*

If the 49th of George 3 applies to the city of Dublin as you suggest, it prohibits the receipt of any other fee than those specified under the schedule of the 49th of George 3?—I fancy not; I have been advised that that is not the case.

Could

Mr. Molesworth Greene (14 May.)

Could you procure for the Committee, the case and opinion which were laid before the late attorney general of Ireland, or a copy of it?—It is locked up among my papers in Dublin, that I could not obtain it unless I was to go over myself; but I will pledge myself, that the Committee shall have it; and I know that the late recorder, and the present recorder, are both exceedingly scrupulous about passing any presentments which we are not entitled to; and when the Committee take into consideration the duties that we perform for it, I think they will consider that we are entitled to it.

Are you aware, that the fees under the 49th of George 3, are also presented to the other officers in the city of Dublin; the clerks of the crown, for instance?—No doubt.

Are you aware, whether they are presented to the sheriffs in the same way?—I am sure they are.

You say, that you took the opinion of the late attorney general for Ireland?—If the Committee will allow me, I will state the circumstances which gave rise to it. There was a magistrate, who is since dead, who was appointed foreman of the sessions grand jury soon after he had served the office of sheriff, as the custom is to appoint the sheriffs peers the foremen of those juries. He was a man who examined as narrowly into our various presentments as he could, and made some objections; in consequence of which, we felt it our duty to get the opinion of the first law officer; and we laid a case before the late attorney general, stating the different presentments we claimed; and he gave it as his opinion, that we were legally entitled to them, and by that the grand juries have since been governed.

Do you recollect whether you stated, that there was any doubt as to the application of that Act to the county or the city of Dublin?—I expressed no such doubt.

Did it strike you, that this Act referred almost entirely to the counties?—No, so far as my humble judgment goes, it is a general Act.

Under what Act are you entitled to a presentment of 40 *l.* for attending the several grand juries?—The 26th of George 3.

In the parliamentary return to which you have referred, setting out the emoluments that you derive from your office as clerks of the peace, you refer to the 50th of George 3, as the authority under which you receive them; what statute of the 50th of the late King is it that you refer to?—I see in the account of our last presentments, there is a presentment made pursuant to an Act passed in the 49th and 50th years of his late Majesty's reign.

What Act of the 50th is it that extends the powers of the 49th of the King to the city of Dublin?—Chapter 103, section 85.

The Act of the 49th of the late King, being by virtue of that statute, extended to the city of Dublin, how can you account for presentments still remaining due under the 23d and 24th of George 3?—Because that is for prisoners tried and acquitted; and the other, I believe, is for prisoners convicted.

Then previously to the 50th of George 3, you had no presentment on prisoners tried and discharged, except that which was under the 23d and 24th of George 3?—Under that Act we were not interdicted from charging the fees, whereas under this, I believe we are.

Are not the very same prisoners, for whom fees are included, under the 23d and 24th of George the 3d, also included under the 49th of George 3?—Yes; but then it only gives under that Act a proportion of 50 *l.* to the sheriffs and gaoler and other persons who were presented to before, and leaves us a sum of 39 *l.* 12 *s.* 8 *d.* under that Act.

But all that was repealed; it is impossible to get under both Acts?—Certainly.

There are several other statutes referred to by you in the return, under which various emoluments are received by you as clerk of the peace?—They are for specific business done; for instance, drawing all the presentments, and attending grand juries, and prosecuting nuisances.

Will you turn to the authority under which you receive 40*l.* a year for attending the grand juries?—That is the 26th of George the 3d.

Is the clerk of the peace appointed secretary under that Act?—We act as secretaries to the sessions grand jury.

Is there any other officer who is also appointed secretary to the grand jury?—There is a secretary to the term grand jury, and we have ever since I came into office, acted as secretary to the grand jury at sessions.

Will you turn to that clause of the 26th of George 3, that authorizes the presentment for prosecuting nuisances?—

[*The witness read the clause from the Act.*]

That

Mr. Molesworth Greene.

(14 May.)

That presentment is not imperative on the grand jury?—It is presented to us for this reason, from the knowledge of the grand jury that we are at much more expense than what we receive.

It is not imperative upon them; it is if they shall think fit?—If they shall think fit.

What are the duties which you perform under that Act?—There is scarcely a grand jury that sits at each quarter sessions, that do not present for the taking down of old houses, and we (immediately upon those houses being presented) are bound to serve the several parties interested with a conditional order, and then when that order is made absolute, it becomes our duty to give an order to the sheriff to abate all those nuisances; if they are traversed, which they frequently are, we are then bound to prosecute that traverse, and to come into court for the public to defend the presentment, and our costs upon a thing of that kind would be very great; there was a presentment a short time since respecting a steam engine, in which the costs would amount to upwards of 100 *l.*

Are those costs paid out of the salary?—We cannot be presented more than what I have stated.

Have you had occasion at every sessions, to make some charge for the presenting nuisances?—There is scarcely a session that passes but what it occurs; the surveyor of Dublin is always in attendance on the grand jury, for the purpose of making returns to the grand jury of all houses that are in a ruinous way, and if upon view by him they are so considered, they are then presented, and there is an order made to abate them within a certain time, forthwith, if they are dangerous.

There is an item appears here of a fee on preparing traverses for presentments?—I did not say any thing yet about any charge we make the party traversing, as a fee on that occasion, but there are a great number not traversed; there are not perhaps, more than one in ten traversed.

Are there any other legal duties with which you are charged by the grand jury, which becomes a source of emolument to you?—We had; we were ordered some years ago to prosecute a person by the grand jury, one of the officers of the prison, for suffering a prisoner to go at large, and there we were presented a sum of money on that account.

There is a charge here for prosecuting William Mansfield, is that one of those cases?—It is.

Who is he?—One of the turnkeys, that let a prisoner escape; but from that period to the present, I do not think we have had another instance.

Can you inform the Committee of any peculiar duties which are cast upon your office, which distinguish your office from that of the clerks of the peace at large?—The clerks of the peace in the counties, are merely bound to attend at sessions, and perhaps two or three days before, to prepare the necessary business; we are bound to keep our office open the whole year round, and from the vast quantity of business that is done in the office, it is impossible that it should be otherwise.

Have you any account of the number of persons indicted and tried at the several sessions?—I have a return that I made the very last return; there are two returns of this date. Here is a return of 1,904 in one year.

[*The witness delivered in the same, the Abstract of which is as follows:*]

Total number of persons Indicted - - - - 1,904.

What are the hours of attendance at your office?—Our office opens between 10 and 11 every day, and does not close till 4; then it is opened again in the evening from 7 till 9.

What are the fees to which you are entitled, by law, for publicans licences in the city of Dublin?—We are entitled to receive 2 *s.* 8½ *d.* for each licence; for which we give a printed certificate and enter the name of the person in a book kept for that purpose.

Are you not entitled to fees upon the registration of freeholders?—We are entitled to one shilling upon each.

There does not appear to be any return made of the amount of those fees in the return which has been made to Parliament; how do you account for that?—It was an omission; the registration of freeholders in the city of Dublin, is not a thing worth mentioning, it does not amount to 5 *l.* a year.

Do you not conceive, that a regulation with respect to your office, which would

substitute

Mr. Molesworth Greene.

(14 May.)

substitute a fixed salary in place of these fluctuating presentments, under the authority of various Acts of Parliament, would be desirable for the public?—If the legislature were pleased to give us a salary equal to the duties we perform, we would much rather, certainly, have it, than be subject to the frequent conflicting opinions of a jury.

In point of fact, have the grand juries exercised any discretion in diminishing the amount of presentments applied for by you?—Never, but in one instance, and that was about the time the opinion I have before mentioned was taken, there was a gentleman that opposed a presentment of 40 *l.* a year.

In the case of prisoners convicted, there is a discretion in the grand juries to diminish the amount of fees, though there is not in the case of prisoners acquitted; do you know of any instance in which that amount has been diminished by the city of Dublin grand jury?—No, I do not.

When you send in your presentments to the grand jury, do you think, that any discretion is left with the grand jury, as to lessening the presentments?—I think that the grand jury certainly might do so in the instance of some presentments, if they thought they exceeded more than we merited; but they never have done so to my knowledge.

Would not you resist any attempt on the part of the grand jury to do so?—I certainly would apply to the court on the subject, and I know the court have always held, that where a sum of money is to be presented *not exceeding a certain sum*, that they are to present for that sum.

What salary do you think would be sufficient to compensate you for all the sums which you receive?—I should feel a delicacy in mentioning any specific salary.

What establishment have you in your office; to what expenses are you necessarily subject by your office?—We have a clerk to whom we pay 130 *l.* a year; another, 100 *l.*; we pay another 80 *l.*; and another 40 guineas; it has been raised lately, and we pay a messenger 30 guineas a year.

What is the total amount of those salaries?—389 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.*

Have you drawn up any statement of the circumstances attending your office, and the duties you are called upon officially to perform?—I have.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

"Statement on behalf of John Allen and Molesworth Greene, esquires, clerks of the peace of the city of Dublin.

"That in the year 1784, John Allen was appointed by the corporation of Dublin under its charter, town clerk, in virtue of which appointment he is also clerk of the peace; and that Molesworth Greene was in like manner appointed to the same situation in the year 1789, since which time both have continued and still continue to enjoy the office of clerks of the peace of the city of Dublin.

"That their receipts from this office averaged, for the last three years, at about 1,870 *l.* yearly, a sum which they believe this honourable Committee will not consider more than reasonable for the joint clerks of the peace of Dublin; and their numerous assistants, when the variety and importance of their continual and laborious duties are considered.

"That the entire business of the quarter sessions is, amongst various other duties, originated and prepared in the town clerks office; that the jurisdiction of quarter sessions is more comprehending in Ireland than in England, perjury and offences of a capital nature being liable and tried at quarter sessions, by the recorder of Dublin and the chairman of Kilmainham; that the jurisdiction of the quarter sessions of the city of Dublin, has been considerably enlarged by the 48 George 3; the statute which created its present police establishment, by which all the county of Dublin within the Circular road, has been added to the jurisdiction of the city quarter sessions; that the vigilance of the police so created has not only much contributed to the security of the metropolis, but to increase the business of the quarter sessions, and that the increase of crime may be inferred from the fact, that the number of commitments to the city gaol called Newgate, more than trebled in the last sixteen years, being in 1805, 628; in 1821, 1,880; and in 1822, to 2,183.

"That it further appears that the city court of quarter sessions, which formerly sat only every six weeks, and is not yet required by statute to sit oftener, is under the necessity of sitting almost weekly throughout the year, or at furthest, by adjournment at ten days interval.

Mr. Molesworth Greene.

(14 May)

“ That from these four causes the enlargement of jurisdiction, the vigilance of an improved police, the great increase of crime, and the utter inadequacy of this single gaol of Newgate for the metropolis, the business of this court and its office has increased to an extent to which no other similar office in this country can make any other than a distant resemblance.

“ That added to these causes, the prevailing anxiety to shorten imprisonment by an early trial, has considerably merged the business of the commissioners of oyer and terminer and general gaol delivery, in the earlier sessions of this court, of nearly co-ordinate jurisdiction.

“ That the result of these causes is, that this court and the office of the town clerks of Dublin, now comprehend a considerable portion of the criminal business of Ireland, and the increase and extent of this business will appear from these facts, that the number of persons committed to Newgate, for trial at the quarter sessions of Dublin, in the year 1819, amounted to 1,529, those in 1820, to 1,733, and those in 1821, to 1,756.

“ That the town clerks of Dublin are therefore obliged to keep their office open for the public, not only during all these adjourned sessions, with a sufficient number of competent persons to assist them, but for the necessary preparatory business, to keep this office open during the entire year; the hours of attendance therein being from ten o’clock in the forenoon until four o’clock in the afternoon, and from seven and half-past in the evening until nine.

“ That the absolute necessity of such attendance, must clearly appear from a simple detail of the urgent responsible and multitudinous duties of the clerks of the peace for the city of Dublin; to draw and give receipts for all recognizances; to receive, collect, and give receipts for all informations returned to them by the police and other magistrates of the city of Dublin; to file all informations sworn against persons for breaches of the peace, together with their recognizances entered into by them for their future good behaviour; to read and consider all other informations; to frame and draw indictments thereon; to engross such indictments; to file the recognizances given for persons to be tried; to summon the prosecutors for the purpose of being sworn to the indictments, previous to their going before the grand jury; to summon the grand juries for their different adjournments; to summon the magistrates; to swear the prosecutors; to send them before the grand juries; to enter in a book the manner in which the grand juries dispose of the indictments; to file the same on sundry files kept for that purpose; to enter in a list book the names of the persons ready for trial on each day; to enter in the crown book the dates of the sittings of the court, together with the names of the magistrates presiding; to enter in the crown book, and also in a book kept for the court, the indictments found against persons in custody; to enter in a book, called the traverse book, the indictments found against persons out on bail, or not in custody, with the residences of the traversers, and the names and residences of their respective sureties, and the sums in which they are severally bound; to summon for the different court days the persons who had previously attended before the grand juries; to prosecute those against whom bills are found; to summon the traversers, their bail and prosecutors, as the court may order them to be brought up for trial on any day not being a traverse day, of which the clerks of the peace give notice through the newspapers; and to have these summonses personally served on each traverser, each of his bail, and each of those bound to prosecute; to attend the court on the sitting days; to arraign the several persons indicted; to enter and record their pleas; to join issue on the part of the crown; to swear petit juries; to attend the trials from the sitting of the court to the rising thereof; to prepare the issues; to swear the witnesses; to receive the verdicts; to record the judgments and different orders by the court, and issue such warrants as may be necessary to carry its sentences into effect, &c. &c.

“ That the receipts first mentioned is the sole renumeration to these joint clerks of the peace for all these services, and that such receipts are not now greater, nor have they been for the last three years, than they were in the year 1815, notwithstanding the increase of duties in that interval.

“ That these receipts are small in their being parts made up of specific and defined fees and considerations, directed by various Acts of Parliament, enacted at different periods, [vide appendix]; and all of these fines and considerations prescribed and ascertained in their smallest minutiæ, by the enactments or schedules making part of these statutes.

Mr. Moleswortk Greene.
(14 May.)

"That the undersigned clerks of the peace of the city of Dublin, not yielding in the extent importance and responsibility of their duties to any of the official and ministerial agents of distributive justice in this country, presume to express their hope and expectation that such emolument cannot appear to the legislature an overpayment for a class of duties so extensive, and are only apprehensive that the very detail of their labours may tire that attention which it would otherwise convince.

"That on the faith of these several Acts of Parliament, and relying on the emoluments of which they regarded these enactments as the guarantee, one of the undersigned clerks of the peace, John Allen devoted his life; and the other, Molesworth Greene, when enjoying a professional income of 1,000 *l.* a year sacrificed this strong promise of professional success to the exclusive duties of this public employment as wholly incompatible (as it is certainly inconsistent) with any other pursuit; and they now feel it unnecessary to appeal to any other sentiment than the justice of the legislature, to protect them at this period of their lives against an alteration of the law, which without conferring any sensible benefit on the public, would inflict a most sensible severity on two public officers, who have devoted, at some sacrifice, the best part of their lives to the public service, in a situation arduous and responsible, with tried integrity and without reproach."

Do you not find that the duties you are called upon to perform are amply sufficient to occupy the whole of your time?—As an instance of that being the case, I would state, that I was in a profession in which I was making a considerable sum of money, at least 1,000 *l.* a year; and I was obliged to relinquish that profession for the purpose of attending to my present duty, and I was obliged also lately to relinquish a most respectable agency which I held.

Do you hold any other public office besides that of clerk of the peace?—I am joint town clerk of Dublin, but that is an office connected with the clerk of the peace.

Is it not amongst other duties imposed on you, to summon magistrates to attend the recorder?—We have lately summoned the magistrates to preside at the sessions and to enter their attendances regularly in the crown book.

Have you not sometimes found great inconvenience arising, in consequence of the non-attendance of the magistrates on those occasions; has not the recorder been delayed in the administration of justice?—Yes; a great number of the gentlemen magistrates have been absent, and a great number of them ill, but when they can attend I am confident it is their wish to do so.

If the recorder were enabled to proceed at once to the administration of his judicial functions, would there not be a quicker dispatch of the criminal business?—I think there would.

And a consequent deduction in the expense of maintaining the prisoners?—Most certainly.

On the whole what may be the amount you are in the habit of receiving in virtue of your office?—At present I cannot inform the Committee; I have a return in my hand, made of the different prisoners that were tried in each of the years 1759, 1769, 1779, 1789 and 1799.

Were those prisoners tried at sessions?—At sessions; and they amount to 1,955 in *five years*, and now in one year we have 1,901.

Have you, in the same way, made a return of the amount of presentments for the clerk of the peace, during those years respectively?—No, I have not; but they must have been proportionably small; it is worthy of remark, that the committals of Newgate in *London*, during the *year* 1822, only exceeded the committals to the gaol of Newgate in Dublin, in the same year by two.

To what causes do you attribute the increase of crime in the city of Dublin?—I do not know, except it be from the very great increase of population.

Have poverty and want of employment increased considerably?—Indeed I should think it has.

Jovis, 15° *die Maii*, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Michael Cullen, called in; and Examined.

[*A part of the Evidence of Dr. Harty on the* 13*th of this month, was read to the Witness.*]

Mr. Michael Cullen.

(15 May.)

HAVE you any observations to make upon that evidence; have you any explanation to give of the circumstances stated in it?—I do not think it was compulsory on the part of the person who took the securities; on the contrary I heard very lately that it was a matter of choice with him to retain those securities or not, and that he did choose to retain them.

Is the substance of the evidence correct?—Really I think it is heightened and incorrect in the statements of it.

In what particulars do you think it heightened or overcharged?—I think the sum he has mentioned is very much over stated, and it is incorrect as to illegal applotments made by the vestries. A doubt exists in the parishes as to the objects for which they may applot; and when doubtful objects have been introduced in the assessments they have been for charitable purposes, or such as were connected with the performance of the church-service, and those doubtful objects might perhaps be sustained under Acts of Parliament, or ancient usage, which would validate them.

Were you deficient in any sum as a public officer when you had ceased to discharge your duties as churchwarden?—At the end of the two years the account was stated by the vestry-clerk, and, as I understand, there was a balance of about 140 *l.* and not 200 *l.* as Dr. Harty stated; and the vestry-clerk was asked whether he would choose to take my security for 100 *l.* of the money, which he did, and I understand the balance lay over in consequence of a resolution of the parish that the succeeding churchwardens should draw upon me for the balance, which they have not done; and the impression upon my mind was that the parish considered themselves very considerably indebted to me for the exertions that I had made on several occasions, to get rid of the jobbing on the part of the grand jury, and therefore they did not intend to call upon me for the balance; but it is a matter of choice with the churchwardens whether they choose to draw upon me or not.

How did you appropriate the money which you received as churchwarden during the period you were in office?—They were sometimes applied by myself, and sometimes by the person who had the care of it. The person alluded to, for instance, disposed of the greater part of it.

Did you appropriate any part of it to your own private expenses?—The balance must of course have been applied to my private purposes, but there were some small sums included in the account which I did not consider myself liable to pay.

Have those securities since become due?—Yes; and part of one of them was discharged.

Have they all become due?—No; whatever remains due is a matter of arrangement between the person who has taken them, and myself; the parish have nothing to do with them. He was asked very lately whether he chose to retain them, or give them back, and look to the parish, and he, I understand, chose to retain them: the parish has never, to my knowledge, sustained any loss by the churchwardens, which have acted within my recollection, or residence in the parish in which I have been a housekeeper near twenty years.

Mr. Michael Maley called in; and Examined.

Mr. Michael Maley.

WHERE do you reside?—In Sackville-street, Dublin.

Have you had occasion to pay any attention to the subject of the local taxation of the city of Dublin?—I have; to the paving and lighting-tax.

Have you any observations to make on the subject of that tax?—I have.

Did you investigate the accounts furnished by the Paving Board to Parliament?—I have investigated the accounts as furnished by the Paving Board, and laid before Parliament by the Commissioners of Accounts; but I have not been able to examine them as narrowly as I could wish, as the particular items charged are not set forth.

Mr. Michael Maley. (15 May.)

Do you consider from your examination that the Commissioners have administered the affairs committed to their hands with economy and discretion?—I do not.

State your reasons for that opinion?—The sum that has been received by the Commissioners of Paving, from the year 1808 to 1821, including a sum of 40,000*l.* from Government, has been 588,460*l.* 13*s.* 2½*d.*, being an average of 48,343*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* per annum.

Previously to the passing of the present act, was any allowances made to the citizens of Dublin by Government on that subject?—10,000*l.* a-year was allowed.

Was that allowance relinquished, and if it was, in consideration of what?—It was relinquished in consequence of Government paying off a debt of 53,000*l.* and giving 40,000*l.* as an outfit to the present establishment.

How is the Paving Board constituted; who are the Commissioners?—Major Taylor, Alderman Bloxham, and, I believe, the third Commissioner is a Mr. Edgeworth. Major Taylor has been Commissioner thirteen years.

By whom are those Commissioners appointed?—By Government.

Is there any legal control exercised by any, and what, authority over the conduct of the Paving Board?—None, except by Government.

How have you ascertained the income of the Paving Board?—By the accounts annually laid before Parliament.

Have you derived any information on the subject from individuals connected either with the Paving Board or the Account Office?—The Paving Board would dismiss any person who should give information.

What reason have you for knowing that?—I was told that a clerk was suspected of making a communication to me, and I gave him a certificate that I had had no communication with him, or with any person whatsoever connected with the paving establishment.

Have you ever heard of the dismissal of Sir Charles Coote?—I have.

Are you aware of the details of that transaction?—I am not, further than I was informed.

Are you aware that Sir Charles Coote was dismissed in consequence of a complaint that was made against him by some of the establishment?—By the keeper of the store, I heard.

Then how can you say that there is any attempt on the part of the Paving Board Commissioners to close inquiry among their servants?—From the Clerk who applied to me on the subject: it is from him that I heard it.

You do not wish the Committee to understand that it is a general system adopted by the Paving Board?—I do; that was from one of their own establishment. The charge brought against Sir Charles Coote was for embezzling stores out of their own establishment. He was an officer of the Board; he knew it; I am not an officer of the Board; and if I was, I should be perhaps better able to explain the various methods than I am now enabled to collect, from comparing their accounts for thirteen years, and tracing out the different transactions.

Did you get any information at the Account Office?—I made application there, and was refused. I then applied by letter to the Lord Lieutenant, and I was referred to Secretary Goulburn. The answer I got from Secretary Goulburn was that it would be attended with inconvenience to examine the details of any account till the account was returned to Parliament. I feared that I should be troublesome. I applied to a gentleman who was very active about the local taxes, a Mr. Stewart, and he told me that if I would put down a few particular questions on paper he would get me answers; he would write to the Commissioners. I did so, and I got a few answers.

Is there any access of any description afforded to the citizens of Dublin, or any of the authorities, except Government itself, to the accounts of the Paving Board?—I never heard of any.

Do you conceive, that affording such access to either the parochial vestries, or the grand juries, or any other local authority, would be productive of benefit?—Most important benefit.

For what reason do you think so?—The abuses that have been going on for years would be necessarily examined into.

Do you not conceive, that the examination of the Commissioners of Accounts is sufficient?—No; they do not consider so themselves, because they are not aware whether the charges are reasonable or just.

Do you know in what year the Paving Act passed?—The 47th of Geo. III. c. 109.

Mr. Michael Maley.

(15 May.)

Have you any reason to imagine that the charges made are not reasonable or just?—I have.

Will you state any facts that lead you to that conclusion?—I made inquiries as to the prices of oil, and I find that in the year 1813, and for years back, that there have been large sums of money taken out of the several balances that are to be in the bank, and not given credit for, except at the foot of the account, where balances were struck, for attendances in England on one of those occasions. The accounts are closed on the 5th of January in each year; and I found in one year, namely the year ending the 5th January 1814, the sum of 10,500 and odd pounds taken out of the account for the purpose of sending to England for oil and flag-stones; this matter struck my attention, and I looked over the accounts, so as to find whether I was perfectly correct or not, in supposing that the money had not been sent, and I found that I was correct; for though the money was charged as having been sent to England for oil, I found that the whole quantity of oil imported into Ireland had not amounted to above 2,400*l.* in that year; the money was drawn out in the current year of 1813, ending the 5th January 1814. There appears, after the accounts were closed, a cash balance in favour of the public 18,961*l.* 13*s.* 10*d.* ½, of which sum there remained in the treasurer's hands, 311*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.*; in the hands of a person of the name of William Bell, 100*l.*; in the bank of Ireland, 2,438*l.* 10*s.* 5*d.*; there remained in the hands of John Glynn, E. Farrall and A. Dowdall, from the year 1810, 1,213*l.* 9*s.* 5*d.*; advanced to law-agent, 1,514*l.* 14*s.*; cash to John Hendrick to remit to England, for buying oil, 6,857*l.* 10*s*; to pay-major Taylor for water-carts, 220*l.*; disallowances in 1812, 1,118*l.* 3*s.* 1*d.* ½; ditto in 1813, 1,081*l.* 12*s.* 9*d.*; excess of establishment, 438*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.* ½; and 3,666*l.* 10*s.* for flag-stones.

From what document did you take that?—From the public accounts.

Was not this account laid before the Commissioners of Accounts?—It was.

Have you got their report upon this account?—I have not; it is amongst the parliamentary papers.

They did not disallow any portion of that?—No; they allowed all sums so alleged to be advanced.

Have you any reason for imagining that any portion of this money stated to be sent to England was not sent?—I have.

What are the grounds of that opinion?—I have told the Committee my reason that the quantity of oil imported into Dublin that year did not amount to 2,300*l.*

Are you aware whether the Commissioners of Paving receive any supply of oil from any of the other outports of Ireland?—None.

Might not that sum that was drawn out have been for oil imported in the previous year?—They always state that as money in advance, and in that case it would not be in advance, it would be in charge; but the oil imported into Dublin in the current year of 1813 was but fifty-seven tons, and taking that fifty-seven tons at even 50*l.* a ton (the general price is 40*l.* a ton) it would not be more than 2,500*l.*, and the flag-stones imported in that year were but 137 tons, which taken at the highest rate of 47*s.* a ton would come to but 321*l.* 19*s.*; so that although it appears that there has been advanced in two years above 11,000*l.* the importations of those articles on which those sums are advanced do not amount to 3,500*l.*

Then you do not know any way in which those sums which are charged as advanced are afterwards accounted for?—They have been accounted for at the end of two or three years; but there was neither oil in the possession of the Paving Board, nor there was not oil on its way from England at the time that money was in advance.

Have you any doubt that it was eventually accounted for?—It was accounted for; but the impression on my mind was that the money was not applied to the purposes for which it was said to be applied.

You mean not at the time?—Not perhaps for a year or two, or more, afterwards.

Have you any reason to imagine that the articles charged for by the Paving Board are charged above the market value?—I have; I sent to England to inquire the market price of oil at different times, and the return was from four to six pounds a tun under what is charged to the public.

Have you any other instance to state with regard to flag-stones, or any other articles of supply?—Only in the course of exchange; there is an over-charge of two or three per cent. on bills of exchange.

Does that overcharge occur in one year only, or in several years?—In several years.

How have you compared the course of exchange charged by the Paving Board, with

Mr. Michael Maley.

(15 May.)

with what you conceive to be the current course of exchange?—I have compared the price of exchange four times in each month from October 1812 to December 1818; I was only able to get the prices of exchange charged by the Paving Board from October 1812 to November 1814, and in those prices, in some cases, the difference amounts to nearly four per-cent.

Will you state the particular instances—Can you state what was the current course of exchange of the day, and what was the charge made by the Paving Board?—The course of exchange in October and November 1812 was from 7¼ to 7½ per cent.

What is the exchange charged by the Paving Board?—Nine per cent. in some instances.

Can you give any other instances of a similar disproportion?—In 1813, in the month of December, the exchange was about 3¼, 4 and 5 per cent, and they have charged 6 and 7 per cent; but the particular days of those charges are not set forth in the returns to the Commissioners; the money was advanced from October 1812 to November 1814, and there is the last of the sums advanced; but they have not put down the date.

You are aware that the difference between the price of bills on the exchange and the bankers price is not less than 1 per cent?—Yes.

It is not likely that they would take bills; it would not be for them to take bills on exchange; and they rather take them from bankers?—That might make a difference of 1 per cent.

Is that circumstance sufficient to account for the different rate of charge made by the Paving Board, as compared with the current rate of exchange of the day?—Certainly not; I am still of opinion that there has been an overcharge.

Do you consider the Paving Tax to be equally levied; or is there any one class of persons more heavily charged than another?—It falls much less heavily on the more wealthy part of the inhabitants than it does on the poor.

Can you state any instances?—I can.

Are you owner of any houses which would enable you to give any information on this subject to the Committee?—I have a house in Sackville-street, for which I pay 9*l.* 13*s.* a-year for the Paving Tax. I also own the houses Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7, which are all shop-houses, and they pay from 9*l.* 13*s.* to 10*l.* 11*s.* paving and lighting-tax.

In the broad part of Sackville-street?—Yes. Lord Norbury's house in Denmark-street pays but about 7*l.* 15*s.*; Baron McClelland's and Alderman Bloxham's in Gardener's-place, pay 5*l.* 19*s.*; Judge Johnson's, in Harcourt-street, pays 4*l.* 1*s.*; the house of the governor of the Bank, in Harcourt-street, pays 5*l.* 19*s.*; and that of the deputy-governor of the Bank, in Leeson-street, pays 3*l.* 19*s.* 9*d.*

Are the houses to which you have last alluded houses of the first class?—They are very capital houses, certainly.

You stated, that the charge upon houses in Sackville-street is greater than the charge upon houses in Gardener's-place, and in Harcourt-street; is not Sackville-street above twice the width of each of those streets?—It does not make any difference in the minister's money, by which all local taxes are rated.

Do you apprehend that in assessing those taxes on those houses they have not taken the minister's money for their rule?—They have no other standard.

Then the irregularity of which you complain arises out of the basis on which the calculation is framed?—It does.

Then you must admit that a new valuation of minister's money would lead to a correction of the evil complained of?—It would be most beneficial to all classes of the citizens, without injury to the tax.

How long have you been a householder of Dublin?—About thirty years.

What was the assessment for the paving-tax for any particular period within the first seven years on the premises which you held?—In the year 1797 I paid 3*l.* 15*s.* a year, for paving and lighting for a house in Capel-street, that was then a very valuable concern, being before the Union.

What was your taxation at that time?—My grand jury cess in 1797 was 19*s.* 2*d.*

What were the other taxes?—The watch-tax was 15*s.* pipe-water money 15*s.*

What are the sums now charged to you for the same taxes?—Last year I paid the grand jury above 12*l.*, watch-tax 3*l.* 18*s.*, pipe-water and metal-main 4*l.* 10*s.* and the paving and lighting tax 9*l.* 13*s.*

What alteration do you conceive has taken place in the value of your premises in Capel-street since the year 1797?—They are not near so valuable as they were.

Can

Mr. Michael Maley.

(15 May.)

Can you form any opinion as to the amount of reduction in value; is it 20 per-cent?—It is about 30 per-cent.

What appears to be the annual increase of taxation upon those premises which are reduced 30 per-cent in value?—In comparison to what I now pay 23 *l.* 4 *s.* 10 *d.*

Do you mean to suggest that the former rate of taxation to which your house was subject would be sufficient to meet the increased necessities of the times, and the demands upon the public?—Certainly not, but a large reduction from the present assessment might be made.

Have you any reason to imagine that under any improved system of management the affairs of the Paving Board might be more economically administered?—Certainly; I think that if the work had been done by contract as it was provided by Parliament, there is no doubt many thousands would have been saved to the citizens of Dublin; I will venture to assert 10,000 *l.* a year the last ten years.

Do you know what were the expenses of the Paving Board formerly?—About 25,000 *l.* a year.

How was that 25,000 *l.* a year met?—10,000 *l.* by parliamentary grant, the rest was levied on the citizens.

Was not there any proportion contributed by the corporation of the city of Dublin?—About 2,300 *l.* per annum.

Out of what fund?—Under their charter, I believe, they are bound to do it.

Have the expenses of the Paving Board considerably increased by reason of the improved lighting and the improved paving?—I think the pavement has fallen into a very dilapidated state latterly, and the lighting is very bad.

Under the new act do not the lights extend farther than they did under the old act?—They do; they extend to the circular road.

And that consequently must account for increase?—To meet that there has been a decrease in the number of lamps in the city; formerly we had a lamp every forty feet, now we have one only every sixty-five feet.

Do you consider from your knowledge of the city of Dublin that the ability on the part of the city to contribute to those taxes is at all reduced in these times?—I believe there are not six members of the House of Commons that have houses in Dublin, and there are but twelve peers who have houses in Dublin; there were at one period immediately before the Union ninety-eight peers inhabited houses.

In what state was the pavement when the present Paving Board was established?—In a very wretched state.

Do you know what were the grounds of the re-modelling of the Board?—The negligence of the former Board.

Do you know how those commissioners were appointed?—The former Board was managed by directors and commissioners.

Who were the directors, and how were they managed?—Lord De Blaquiere was one, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chief Justice, and other public officers.

Was there any misapplication of the public money by the late Board?—They got greatly in debt; I never saw their report, but I believe they did not misapply it, because the treasurer afterwards got a pension.

How are the rates of the Paving Board levied?—By the collector.

By whom is he appointed?—By the Commissioners.

Do you conceive that it would be an improvement in the administration of the local affairs of Dublin to establish one central office for the collection of the whole of the local taxes?—I think it would; I think it could not be worse managed than it is at present.

Are you aware what was the maximum allowance to the Paving Board by law?—4 *s.* 6 *d.* in the pound, and it never has been reduced.

Have they always, in point of fact, charged the utmost they were by law allowed?—They have, and expended a great deal of money in recovering it in very unnecessary litigation.

The state of the pavement being very bad at the time of the passing of the Act of the 47th of the late king, can you inform the Committee whether it was put in repair by them?—The expenditure of the first four years was upwards of 54,000 *l.* a-year; it was then considered that for ever afterwards repairing would do, and Parliament, in order to enable the Commissioners to enter into contract, appointed two inspectors at 400 *l.* a-year; supervisors, they were called.

Are you acquainted with the rates of labour in the city of Dublin?—I am.

Have the rates of labour fallen?—They have fallen latterly.

Mr. *Michael Maley.*

(15 May.)

Is there any alteration in the price of labour and horse-work?—There must be, because corn is a great deal cheaper; the whole commission is managed by Major Taylor.

Having stated that you consider a considerable portion of those funds to have been expended in improper or ill advised litigation, can you give any instance to the Committee?—When the Paving Board removed to Mary's-street they wanted to put up a shed for carts, and made a small aperture into the house adjoining; the lady who owned the house made a complaint about this, and she could get no redress; she desired her attorney, Mr. Walker, to apply to the Board to get some compensation, and Mr. Walker, after some proceedings had gone on, proposed to take 50*l.* or to leave the business to arbitration. Major Taylor said he had a right to make the aperture, and they went to law; an issue was ordered, and there was 350*l.* damages and costs to pay; so that though it was first a small hole in the wall, it cost about 700*l.* before it was closed.

Can you state what have been the total expenses of litigation?—About 6,600*l.*

Does that include the expense of procuring the Act?—No.

Can you state any instance in which you consider the conduct of the Paving Board to have been oppressive to the citizens at large?—There was an instance with regard to the Gas Company; the gas-pipe burst, and there was a very general complaint, and they took up about eighteen inches square, and Major Taylor fined them 5*l.* and they would not pay it, and there was a law suit.

May not those instances be considered as casual, and not leading to any general conclusion against the Board?—I can only draw this conclusion, that it is the opinion of the public that 6,600*l.* is a great deal to be spent in law-suits.

Are you aware that there are police powers which they must administer, and which must necessarily lead to great expense?—I am not aware of them.

Exclusive of the amount which you state to have been expended in litigation, are there any other matters of charge introduced into the account which you consider objectionable?—I think there are; there is a payment made to Sir Charles Coote during his absence on general Post-office business; I believe rather a partial payment.

Why do you consider it a partial payment?—It is charged Post-office account from January 1811 to the 5th January 1817. That Sir Charles Coote received 13,447*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.* from that establishment for surveying roads; during the same period he was paid out of the local taxes of the city of Dublin, 400*l.* a year, without any deduction whatever; in addition to which, he was also paid three guineas a day for 103 days, out of the paving-tax, for attending in London about an Act of Parliament; those charges coming together, and being both paid to a person who was not on duty for the public.

Are you not aware, that a considerable part of the payment to Sir Charles Coote by the Post-office was not made individually to him, but was made to other persons besides?—There were three other persons employed in the same business, but his individual share was as I have stated; the only remark I presume to make is this, that he being absent, and earning money from the Government of the country, it was not, in my mind, just, to pay him also from the Paving Board.

Can you state the amount paid for rent and taxes during any of the years last past?—The rent in the year ending 5th January 1813, was 1,273*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.* charged and paid, however the whole amount returned, pursuant to an order of the House of Commons, 10th March 1823, was 617*l.* 3*s.* 10*d.* being an incorrect return of 656*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* in one year.

From what documents are you enabled to state, that the rent and taxes are more than what is contained in this return?—From the accounts as settled before the commissioners of public accounts in Ireland.

Can you state what the rent and taxes appear to be for the year ending the 5th of January 1812?—For the year ending 5th January 1812, the amount paid was 645*l.* 9*s.* 10½*d.*

What was it in the following year?—For the year ending the 5th January 1814, the rent charged was 631*l.* 10*s.*

Can you state the total amount of rent and taxes paid from the formation of the Paving Board up to the present time?—Up to the year 1821, 8,009*l.*

How much does that average?—616*l.* annually.

Are you aware of any provision in the Act which limits the amount?—In the 47th Geo. III. it is limited to 250*l.* a year, and ought to have continued so until the Act passed of 54 Geo. III.

Mr. Michael Maley.

(15 May.)

Are you aware of the amount of salaries paid?—The salaries and allowance have averaged about 6,500*l.* a year, exclusive of annuities.

Is the amount of salaries also limited by law, and what is that limit?—5,600*l.* per annum.

Are you aware whether any proportion of this excess has been disallowed by the Commissioners?—There has, to the amount of 3,043*l.* that has never been refunded, as I understand.

Has the evil augmented in any respect?—I do not know that it has; their funds will not allow them to augment it.

Are you not aware of the act of the 54th of George the Third, by which the powers of the Board were augmented?—Yes, to 800*l.* a-year.

Then did the disallowances to which you refer, and the excess of rent which you have stated, take place before the passing of the 54th of George the Third?—Yes, they did.

There is a power given to the Paving Board under the last Act, to build oil-stores and other offices; do you conceive that power has been beneficial to the public?—I think it has not; I think the expenses should be paid by a contractor.

Have you any knowledge of any arrangement made with respect to those accounts which enables the Board to suppress the real amount of salaries paid?—Yes; they charge as weekly wages where salaries have been paid.

Can you give any instances?—In the instance of a Mr. Bell; they appointed him at a salary of 300*l.* a-year as inspector, and they ordered it to be charged as weekly wages, to bring it under that head in the lighting department account; and I have no doubt, if I could obtain permission to examine the accounts, that I should find several such practices resorted to.

Have you ever applied to get access to those accounts?—I did not; I was well apprized that I should be refused.

What reason have you to think you should be refused?—I was about applying at the time the principal clerk came to me to know how I got my information.

Are there any other charges in the account which you consider to be prodigal, or wasteful in themselves?—Yes; I think the charges for cart and horse-hire are excessive.

Can you refer to the particular items of which you complain?—Yes; there has been for the purchase of horses forage and stabling expenses; the total in thirteen years was 39,000*l.*, making 3,000*l.* a-year for horses and forage, that is, exclusive of cart and horse-hire, for paving, for cleansing, and for flagging; how this 3,000*l.* a-year is expended, I will mention.

Does not that include all the smiths and carpenters work, and iron and ropes?—It does; but then the cart and horse-hire is in itself an enormous expense. Part of this 3,000*l.* a-year is for horses purchased in one year, 323*l.*; for hay and oats, 1,075*l.*; for straw, 44*l.*; for bran, 36*l.*; for potatoes, barley and seeds, 34*l.* 18*s.*; and paid for harness and other trifling disbursements, 149*l.*, being a total of 1,650*l.*

Can you state whether the charge for horses and forage, and things of that description, have diminished of late years?—Last year, I believe, they have; the charges for cart and horse-hire for the year ending 5th January 1814 amount to 4,776*l.* 8*s.* 4*d.*; January 1815, 6,668*l.* 9*s.* 10*d.*; and to January 1813, 7,112*l.* 3*s.* 9*d.*

Can you give the Committee any information with respect to lighting?—I cannot, except as to the charges for oil that I have mentioned, except that I consider about 2,500*l.* a-year might be saved by a contract.

You have nothing more to mention on that subject?—Nothing more.

Have you any reason to imagine that there is any unfairness in the charges made for oil, except the reasons which you have formerly alluded to?—None; I am convinced that the charges have been excessive, and beyond what was paid.

There was a return made, in obedience to an order from this House, stating the amount of law-costs in January 1818; that return amounted to 1,836*l.* only; have you any reason to know that the expenses incurred in law-costs were greater than that amount?—In that year the sum paid out of the funds for law costs was 3,607*l.* 5*s.* 11½*d.*

How have you obtained that information?—From the public accounts.

Have you turned your attention to any mode of reducing the amount of this taxation?—By having the work executed by contract.

Is there no contract at present?—None. Major Taylor has made a return; and he says "we do not approve of any that has been presented."

Mr. Michael Maley.

(15 May.)

Is there any contract for lighting the city?—No. Mr. Richard Palmer made offers for it, but Major Taylor would not listen to it; he advertised for lighting with gas, in the year 1815, as a matter that would be desirable; but he has set his face against it, with marks of hostility.

Is the flagging of Dublin all effected with Yorkshire stone?—Not now; it was for a considerable time; but Mr. Peel was applied to, when he was in Ireland; and he interfered; however, afterwards, when Mr. Peel returned, Mr. Taylor sent to England again.

Has he since continued to procure the Yorkshire stone?—Within the last eight or ten months he has ceased to do so.

Are you aware of the difference of price between the Yorkshire stone and the Irish stone?—The Irish flagging comes a great deal cheaper; for instance, the Yorkshire flagging will not bear re-cutting after eight or ten years, but the Irish flagging can be re-cut for 40 years. I also waited on Mr. Mullens and other eminent builders, and their opinions are decidedly the same. Vast sums of money have been sent to England for flagging; and I am firmly of opinion that on an investigation of the accounts it will be discovered that there have been large sums in some persons hands for above a twelvemonth, or perhaps more, contrary to Act of Parliament.

Have you any reason to find fault with the manner in which the city of Dublin is paved; do your objections extend to the paving as well as to the system of lighting?—They do, because I think it might be done much cheaper and better than latterly.

Does it strike you that the paving, comparatively, is worse than the paving in the city of London?—It ought to be a great deal better, for the tax is six times as much in Dublin as it is in London.

Do you know whether the Commissioners are unwilling, if applied to, to exercise their powers?—I think not.

Do not they charge upon any works done?—Yes, they do.

Have you found any unwillingness on their part, if a representation is made to them of a violation of the Act of the 47th of the late King, to put the provisions of the law into execution?—Never.

Then how do you account for what you stated respecting their unwillingness to contract for the paving and lighting, because there is a special clause in the Act to that effect?—It is generally supposed that they will not pursue the most saving system that could be adopted; and no doubt if that were established the charges attending the different establishments are very excessive, and as there are a great variety of officers they are liable to be pillaged.

Has not the price of oil fallen very considerably since the year 1807 and the intervening years?—It is not now more than one half.

The wages of workmen have also fallen?—Very considerably.

Are you aware of any considerable reduction of salaries made by the authority of the Paving Board?—The salaries of the inferior officers have been decreased.

For instance, the office of supervisor of scavengers at 100 *l.* a-year?—I do not know with respect to that.

Do you know whether the office of supervisor, at a salary of 120 *l.* has been reduced?—I do not know.

Do you know whether the situation of supervisor has not been struck off?—I do; only one is now employed.

Do you know that certain reductions of salaries have taken place?—Yes.

But no reduction of salaries has taken place on the part of the Commissioners themselves?—Most certainly not, that I could discover.

The price of oil having fallen, and workmens wages having fallen, and the price of forage having fallen, and salaries being reduced, how do you account for the tax being as high now as it was formerly?—The Commissioners do not seem inclined to relieve the citizens by any means; the streets are worse paved now than they were six years ago; they are now in a very bad state.

There are the same number of collectors of the tax now as there have been heretofore?—There are.

Do those collectors get the full rate of per-centage?—They do; there could be a great saving with regard to collection. There are a number of gentlemen who have had annuities for the last fourteen years, who do not do any business; they have an annuity of 200 *l.* a year. If they were obliged to take the collection, or pay persons for so doing out of their fund, it would be a great relief to the citizens by lightening them of such a burden.

Does

Mr. Michael Maley. (15 May.)

Does it appear to you that all the officers appointed under this Act have the maximum salary allowed by this Act?—Yes.

And according to your knowledge there has been no decrease in latter times in those salaries?—Certainly not, excepting the inferior officers.

Do you know any instance of hardship in the powers exercised by the Commissioners in pulling down houses, and erecting porticos?—I heard some complaint on that subject; but as they did not relate to the tax, I did not concern myself about them.

Veneris, 16° die Maij.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Richard Purdy, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Purdy. (16 May.)

CAN you give the Committee any information on the subject of the paving and lighting tax?—The amount levied by the Commissioners of paving is excessive; the rates are continued at the maximum authorized by the acts of 1809 and 1814, although the value of labour and oil has fallen nearly fifty per-cent since those rates were established; the reduction in oil may be seen by this abstract, from the London prices current in 1810, 1815, and 1823.

Did you make this abstract yourself?—I did.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

Prices of oil at London.

		January.	March.	August.	December.
1810.	Cod	£. 40.	£. 47.	£. 45.	£. 44.
	Whale	38.	42.	40.	40.
	Seal	48.	48.	44.	42.
	South Sea Whale	42.	45.	47.	46.

Average price of Seal-Oil in 1810 - - - £. 45. 10*s.* per Tun.

		January.	March.	August.	December.
1815.	Cod	£. 44.	£. 44.	£. 39.	£. 35.
	Greenland Whale	44.	38.	42.	36.
	South Sea ditto	45.	48.	43.	36.
	Seal, Brown	47.	44.	40.	34.
	Pale	51.	49.	50.	39.

Average price of Seal-Oil in 1815 - - - £. 41. 5*s.*

		January.	March.	May.
1823.	Cod	£. 22.	£. 22.	£. 22.
	Greenland Whale	25. or 26.	24.	22.
	South Sea ditto	27.	26.	25.
	Seal, Brown	23.	22.	22.
	Pale	27.	26.	26.

Average price of Seal-Oil in 1823 - - - £. 22. 6 *s.* 8 *d.* per Tun.

1810. - - - - - - - £. 45. 10 *s.* 0 *d.* per Tun.
1815. - - - - - - 41. 5. –
1820. - - - - - - 22. 6. 8.

Average price of Whale-Oil in 1823 - - - £. 24.

1810. - - - - - - - £. 40.
1815. - - - - - - 40.
1823. - - - - - - 24.

Richard Purdy.

By this it appears that the average price of seal-oil in the year 1810 was 45*l.* 10*s.* and in the year 1823, 22*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* a tun?—It was.

And that the average price of whale-oil in 1810 was 40*l.* a tun, and in the year 1823, 24*l.* a tun?—Yes.

Can you inform the Committee what description of oil is used by the Commissioners of the Paving Board?—Usually whale-oil; the Commissioners occasionally use a quality inferior to the average of whale-oil.

Are you aware what was the charge made by them for oil in the year 1810, and what in the year 1823?—I am not.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(16 May.)

Are you aware whether the number of lamps has increased in the interval between 1810 and 1823?—On the contrary one of the first acts of the Commissioners, subsequently to their obtaining those rates, was to take down nearly one third of those lamps; and from the remainder, one of the two burners which each contained was also removed.

Did they not at the same time extend the surface to be lighted by the interval between the bounds of the old city and the circular road?—They did.

You cannot inform the Committee what the amount charged for oil was and is by the Commissioners for Paving?—I cannot.

Nor the rate at which that oil is charged by the gallon, or tun?—I cannot.

Can you inform the Committee whether the tax has diminished in the interval between the year 1810 and 1823?—The tax has been continued at the maximum rate, and is demanded at that rate for the current half year.

Have the Commissioners announced their intention to reduce those rates?—They have not.

Can you account for the continuance of those rates at the maximum?—Without going into the subject of charges which have heretofore been made against some members of the establishment, I would say that the expense of the present establishment is one material cause. More than one fourth of the sum annually collected is expended in salaries, pensions, rents, stationery, and law-costs.

Are you not aware that though the salaries of the Commissioners themselves are not decreased, the salaries of subordinate officers of the establishment have been reduced considerably?—They have. Those reductions commenced under the order of Mr. Grant, when he was secretary for Ireland, and amounted to nearly 2000 *l.* per annum.

Has the reduction of those salaries occasioned any diminution of the taxes to the public?—It has not.

Has it produced any more enlarged or better execution of the duties of the Paving Board?—I rather think not.

Are you aware how that sum so saved is appropriated?—I am not.

Is the pavement in a better state now than it was before the increased rates were given?—It is, in the leading streets. In 1809 Government advanced 40,000 *l.* to the Commissioners to enable them to put the streets and sewers in a state of permanent repair, and since that time the sums annually applied by the Commissioners to the purpose seldom exceeded 10,000 *l.*

Supposing the streets to have been thus put in a state of permanent repair, can you state to the Committee the probable expense of keeping them in that state under an economical system of management?—I hold in my hand a contract entered into with the Commissioners of Paving dated 1801, for one of six districts into which the city was then divided; by this the contractors were engaged to keep the district in repair for three years, at an average of about one penny and one third of a penny per square yard.

Can you state whether that was pavement or gravel?—Pavement.

Under the present Commissioners is there not a considerable proportion gravelled?—There is.

Is not the expense of gravel less than that of pavement?—Considerably less.

Have you got any proposal which has been made for a contract?—I hold in my hand a proposal from the same parties who contracted before, dated 1804, tendering for another contract upon nearly the same terms.

How are the prices of labour at the present moment, as compared with the prices in 1801?—Considerably lower.

Do you conceive that contracts could be made on equally advantageous terms at the present moment?—I conceive that they could; and I am of opinion that gravel, if properly attended to, would be fully sufficient for a considerable portion of the streets.

Do you employ any labour, or pay any horse-hire yourself, in your establishment?—I do.

Have you found the rates of daily labour and of horse-hire which you have to pay in your individual capacity, diminished?—Full fifty per-cent. The Commissioners of Paving pay their scavengers one shilling per day, out of which the labourers buy brooms.

Can you state what the present rate of charge for paving is by the square yard?—The Commissioners do not take contracts; they charge to individuals at the rate of 2 *s.* per square yard for re-paving such parts of the streets as it may be found necessary to break up for private purposes; 6 *d.* per square yard for new strees, exclusive of 1 *s.* 6 *d.* per square foot for the flagging.

Mr. Richard Purdy.

(16 May.)

Can you state at what rate the Commissioners charge the Pipe Water Committee and the Gas Companies for pavement?—2 *s.* per square yard.

Is that the maximum which they are allowed by law to charge?—It is.

Have you ever heard of any instances in which they have charged less than that maximum?—Never; I have heard many complaints of the excessive rate of those charges, as well as of those for making sewers; 25 *l.* per perch with ledges, and 18 *s.* per perch for plain sewers.

Do those rates which are imposed under the authority of the Paving Board press peculiarly upon any description of property?—Yes; the rate given by the Acts of 1809 and 1814, the latter in particular, press particularly on mercantile and manufacturing establishments; for instance, a concern in James's Street paid for paving and lighting, 6 *l.* 13 *s.* 4 *d.* in 1800; 8 *l.* 9 *s.* 4 *d.* in 1809; and 22 *l.* 4 *s.* since 1814; yet the value of the concern at present is not one fourth of what it was in 1800. The rates payable on a concern of my own were advanced by those Acts upwards of fifty per-cent.

Are the Commissioners of Paving also intrusted with the duty of lighting the city?—They are.

Has any part of the city been lighted with gas?—Not by the Commissioners; individuals, and some of the public offices, have at their own expense lighted with gas.

Have you known any tenders made to the Commissioners to light the city with gas upon terms not exceeding the present charge for lighting?—Yes; I have been told by a member of a respectable coal-gas company that they have made several attempts to make contracts for lighting the city with gas at the same rate at which it is now lighted; and an oil-gas company have made similar attempts with no better success, although the application was supported by many respectable inhabitants.

Do you know whether the lighting department is done by contract, or done under the individual control of the Paving Board?—Under the individual control of the Paving Board, and not by contract.

Do you conceive that by the introduction of the contract system, both with regard to paving and lighting, that a more economical arrangement might be made for the public?—I do.

Have you any doubt of that?—I am perfectly satisfied, that under a Board properly constituted, under which a contractor would have fair competition, that such would be the effect.

Have you any reason to think that the present constitution of the Board opposes any difficulty in the way of fair and honourable contract?—I have no charge to make against the present Board, further than the expense of the establishment; they do not make contracts.

Then you conceive that under the direction of the present Paving Board, the contract system being introduced, and honestly administered, would produce very considerable economy to the public?—I do, particularly if the expense of the establishment can be reduced; but I conceive, and it is the general opinion in Dublin, that the most effectual remedy for the excessive expenditure would be to give to such Board as may be established the control of this as well as all other levies for local purposes; and that the accounts, contracts, and rejected offers for contracts, should be open to inspection. Much complaint arises from the excessive powers vested in the present Board, and by the occasional arbitrary conduct of the Commissioners, who are frequently accusers, judges and executive, in cases of alleged violation of the Paving Act. Upon one occasion they refused to permit the attendance of counsel on behalf of a citizen, a Mr. Coyne, who was cited before them. They desired a fine against Mr. Coyne, who appealed, and succeeded in quashing the proceedings. The jurisdiction of the Commissioners extends to those parts of the city which being in the county are out of the jurisdiction of the city grand jury and other boards of city taxation. The inhabitants of those districts are exempted from the general road presentments of the county grand jury, by the 79th section of the Paving Act of 1807, which is a precedent for the relief sought by the citizens relative to the grand jury tax.

Can you state the present expense of lighting each lamp?—I believe the number of lamps to be about 6,000; the expense of the lighting department in 1821 was stated by the Commissioners to be 9,326 *l.* 5 *s.* 7 ½ *d.*, to which should be added two fifths of the expense of the establishment, two fifths being chargeable to the paving, and one fifth to the scavenging department; the rate would thus exceed 2 *l.* per lamp, and from the present low price of oil the charge by contract should not exceed 1 *l.* 5 *s.*

What reason have you for saying that the charge should not exceed 1 *l.* 5 *s.*?—

Mr. Richard Purdy. (May 15.)

The last contract that was made was at 1 *l.* 9 *s.*, when oil was nearly double the price it is at present.

At what time was that?—Immediately prior to the establishment of the present system of having the work done under the directions of the Commissioners, and not by contract.

What evidence have you of that contract, and the rate at which it was made?—I have heard it very generally stated in Dublin.

You have not seen the contract?—I have not.

Have you ever had occasion to make an application to the Commissioners of Paving to put the law of the 47th of George the Third into execution?—I have not; but the law expenses of the Board are very heavy; in the return for 1821, the amount is stated at 1,752 *l.* 15 *s.* 5 *d.*

Mercurii, 21° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Andrew Coffey, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Andrew Coffey. (21 May.)

WHAT is your situation?—I am engineer to the water-works at Dublin.

How long have you filled that situation?—Since the commencement of the year 1807.

As engineer of the water-works at Dublin, are you apprized of the rates at which the paving board make their charges for the paving of streets broken up under the authority of the water companies?—Yes.

At what rates were the directors of the water-works of Dublin charged at the first establishment of the present paving board?—In the first instance it was done by contractors for 1 *s.* a yard, but they fell out with the contractors, and then they paved it with their own people, and charged two shillings a yard.

Do you, in your answer, limit the information you have given to the Committee to the present paving board?—To the present paving board.

How long did they charge you at the rate of 1 *s.* a yard?—But a few months or weeks.

In what year did they commence charging you 2 *s.* a yard?—The same year that the board was established by Act of Parliament, in the year 1807.

By the 47th of the King?—It was.

Have they continued up to the present time, to charge you at the rate of 2 *s.*—They have.

Are you acquainted with the wages of labour in the city of Dublin?—Yes.

During the interval which has elapsed since the year 1807 or 1808, has there not been a fall in labour?—There has.

Is not labour in point of fact, at the present moment lower in Dublin than it was in the war prices of 1812 and 1813?—It is a great deal lower.

Can you inform the Committee how much per cent you conceive it is lower?—The difference in common labourers may be about 25 per cent.

Has there been any reduction made by the paving board in proportion to this reduction in the price of labour?—None, whatever.

In point of fact, is not the rate charged by the paving board, the highest rate or the maximum, which they are entitled to charge under the Act?—Exactly.

They never have charged less than the maximum, except for that short period, during which the contract system subsisted?—No.

What is the charge of paving for private individuals?—I could do it well for ninepence per yard; I have done some work for the commissioners of Excise lately in the interior of their court yard at the custom house, where the paving board has no control, and it did not cost me so much as ninepence per yard.

Do you think that is as well done as the average execution of the work under the paving board?—Fully as well.

Mr. John Peters, called in; and Examined.

Mr. John Peters.

WHERE do you reside?—In Kildare-street, in Dublin.

How long have you resided in that city?—All my life time.

Have any circumstances of late led you to pay any peculiar attention to the subject of the local taxation of the city of Dublin?—Yes.

What

Mr. *John Peters.*

(21 May.)

What have those circumstances been?—The general complaint of the householders of Dublin as to the local taxes being very oppressive.

Do you mean that those complaints have originated in any increase of the local taxation?—I do.

In what parish do you reside, in the city of Dublin?—I have been a householder in St. Ann's parish for nearly thirty years.

Has there been a petition presented to the House of Commons on behalf of St. Ann's parish?—There has.

Were you one of the individuals employed in framing that petition?—I was.

Have you come over in consequence of that petition?—Certainly not; I have come over by order of the House of Commons, in order to support the statements and allegations in that petition, if the Committee of the House should call on me so to do.

Were you authorized to do so by any of the other inhabitants of the parish in which you reside?—I was requested to do so at a vestry, at which the minister and churchwardens, together with the parish were assembled, if called on by the Committee or summoned.

Was that recommendation unanimous?—There was not a dissentient voice.

Are you aware that the corporation of the city of Dublin are subject to a certain contribution in aid of the paving of the city by the statute?—I am.

Do you know, or have you any reason to know, that the corporation have not of late paid the contribution which they are bound to pay to the paving board?—I understand they have not paid latterly.

It appears that that contribution is charged upon the tolls and customs of the city of Dublin, do you know why it is so charged?—I can state from reference to the charter, that the tolls and customs were originally granted together with the fairs and markets, for the express purpose of paving the city of Dublin, and performing public works.

Can you state the express words in which that grant is made?—For the walls, pavements, ports, bridges, wharfs, and other affairs and public works of the said city.

From what document have you read those words?—From the charter of the city of Dublin.

Of what date is that charter?—In the third year of the reign of King James the Second, before he abdicated.

Where did you get access to that charter?—In the rolls office.

It is a charter there enrolled?— It is.

And you obtained access to it through the proper officer?—By having heard that the corporation had paid 150*l.* for translating it; I went to the rolls office and inquired for Mr. Nash the proper officer.

What office does Mr. Nash hold?—He is the principal person in the rolls office in Dublin; I am not quite certain whether he is the proper officer, but he is the principal officer.

From him you obtained that information?—From him I obtained the information.

Do you know any thing as to the principle upon which the local taxes are imposed in the city of Dublin by the local authorities there?—I do.

What can you state to the Committee on that subject?—It appears to me, that the corporation of the city of Dublin throw on the householders the payment of certain sums of money in the shape of local taxation which they ought to pay themselves; and I will instance one of them if the Committee will allow me.

What taxes do you allude to?—I allude to the salaries of the officers to the amount of 2,800*l.* a year.

What salaries do you allude to?—I will mention one, merely as an instance of the mode and manner of levying money on the householders of Dublin; by the charter I have mentioned, they are ordered to have a council house to meet together for the purpose of consulting on corporation business; the rent of this I should suppose they ought to pay; the annual rent of this house to the amount of 328*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* is thrown on the householders of Dublin, by charging the entire amount of the rent and taxes as a pipe water office; I mention that merely as a circumstance to elucidate the mode of levying the taxes.

Are there any other particular instances to which you can refer, unconnected with the pipe water and metal main question, in which you conceive charges are cast upon the public, which ought to be borne by the corporation?—It appears that the profits on fairs and markets were granted for certain purposes mentioned in the

Mr. John Peters. (21 May)

charter which I have stated for public works; and with respect to those fairs and markets, I shall mention an instance where Alderman West assumes to himself the letting three markets, the meat, poultry, and fruit market, to a person of the name of Finlay and Moss and another person, at an annual rent of 600*l.* a year, although the ground on which those markets stand, is not worth more than about 60*l.* a year.

How do you attribute to this agreement any increase of charge to the citizens of Dublin, to which they are not fairly subjected?—The corporation took the fairs and markets for certain specific purposes

What did they do with them?—They apply the profits of the fairs and markets to their own use, as appears in this instance of Alderman West.

How do the corporation let those fairs and markets, how are they conveyed to Alderman West?—I have made particular inquiry, and I find a man of the name of Clarke took those markets.

What do the corporation get for those fairs and markets?—Alderman West derives immediately under the corporation

What do the corporation get?—As to the private agreement between the corporation and Alderman West I have not been able to ascertain that, but Alderman West receives 600 *l.* a year from Finlay the lessee.

From whom does Alderman West receive this?—From Mr. Finlay, the clerk of the market.

What does Mr. West pay the city?—I cannot tell what he pays the city, but I am quite satisfied that this money ought to go in liquidation of what is levied on the householders in the shape of grand jury cess.

What reason have you for that opinion?—From having made particular inquiry, and having read the charter of the city of Dublin.

Does the charter say any thing about grand jury cess?—No.

Then if the charter does not say any thing about grand jury cess, how comes it to pass that you have given it as the reason why those market rents should be applied in liquidation of grand jury cess that the charter so provided?—The charter grants the fairs and markets, together with the tolls and customs for the performance of public works; and under the head of grand jury cess, those monies are levied on the householders of Dublin, which are provided for by the charter.

You understand grand jury cess to be a public work, which, under the provision of the statute, the corporation ought, so far as their funds go, to provide for?—The grand jury are in the habit of presenting for public works.

Has not all power given to grand juries for levying money by presentment been given by laws passed subsequent to the charter?—I do not know when grand jury power originated, but the point of view in which I see it is, that the monies which ought to have gone towards defraying the expense of the public works of the city of Dublin, have been levied on the householders of Dublin, through the medium of presenting grand juries.

You mean that the funds given by the charter were not applied?—They were misapplied; I will mention an instance if the Committee will allow me; I naturally conceived that Mr. Madon of Donnybrook, who holds the fair of Donnybrook should pay fees to the corporation, and I went to Mr. Madon, and asked him; he told me that he was tenant to a Mr. Usher; I thought it rather extraordinary, and I set about ascertaining who Mr. Usher derived those fees from, and I found that Mr. Usher became a tenant to the corporation for lands near Donnybrook, and I found him in what is commonly termed their private rental, for a rent of 100*l.* a year.

Are you aware what Mr. Madon pays to Mr. Usher?—No I am not; but I understand that Mr. Madon derives a clear profit of about five or six hundred pounds a year from this fair.

From what printed document is it that you have derived the statement you have last made?—From the rental of the city of Dublin.

> [The witness delivered in a printed document, purporting to be "The Account of Alderman William Henry Archer, treasurer to the city of Dublin, for the receipts, issues and profits, accruing to the said city, commencing 29th September 1816, and ending 29th September 1817; to which is prefixed the Rental of the Estates of the said city."]

With respect to the ferries, it appears that the corporation of the city of Dublin took them under this charter, at a yearly rent of 24*l.*; they are let to Alderman Beresford

Mr. John Peters.

(21 May.)

Beresford and Mr. Welsh, at the sum mentioned in the rental of 300*l.* per annum, and upwards.

In the same document?—In the same document.

What do you infer from that; what additional charge is cast upon the householders of Dublin by reason of the agreement which you have stated to exist between the corporation and Alderman Beresford?—If those tolls and customs, fairs and markets, the ferries, and the other profits and immunities that the corporation are entitled to, were applied as they should be, I conceive that the grand jury cess would altogether cease; that the profits and immunities, as they are particularly expressed in the charter, are given for the performance of certain duties, and it appears to me, that they take the monies and profits, although they neglect the duties.

They do not apply the receipts to those purposes?—By no means.

Have you made any comparative estimate, as to the pressure of local taxation in the city of Dublin and in the city of London, and the mode in which they are respectively administered?—The best estimate that I could possibly make comparatively between London and Dublin, is, that the local taxes in the city of Dublin amount, on an average, to about a pound a foot on the frontage of houses, generally speaking; the same local taxes in the city of London, appear to me to be not more than 10*s.* a foot.

Do you mean the average of the whole of Dublin?—Yes.

Do you go for instance, to such streets as Francis-street and James's-street?—Yes; I have not made very extensive inquiries in London, but such inquiries as I have made amount to what I have stated.

Have you obtained a copy of the charter, granted to the city of Dublin, by James the Second?—I have not an attested copy.

Do you know whether the charter of the city of Dublin has been printed since the translation has been made; you stated that the corporation paid 150*l.* for a translation?—So Mr. Nash told me.

Do you know that the charter in that form has been printed or is in print?—Not that I have ever heard of; on the contrary, I have heard that it has been kept secret from the householders,

Do your observations apply to the charter of James?—Yes.

Then they do not apply to the other charters of the city of Dublin?—I consider that Dr. Lucas's publication is a partial one.

Is it not a publication of the charters of the city of Dublin?—It is a partial one.

In what respect?—Because it has not published all.

What has it omitted?—It has omitted the charter of James, and I believe others.

Is the Committee to understand from you, that you consider the charters of the city of Dublin have been intentionally kept secret from the public?—I do.

Is the Committee to understand that the charters of the city of London are fairly and liberally open to public inspection?—They are.

And that the charters of the city of Dublin are studiously kept out of view?—Clearly so; as a proof of the publicity of the charter of the city of London, Mr. Woodthorpe handed me the charters of London in a moment.

Did you ever apply to any of the corporate authorities of Dublin for access to the charters?—I did.

What answer did you get?—A vague indefinite answer; I applied to Mr. John Allen the town clerk.

Do you not believe, that the very charter which you conceive to be improperly concealed, is accessible to every body at the Rolls office?—I will explain the way in which it is accessible at the Rolls office; the corporation gave the late Mr. Nash 150*l.* for translating it; I do not know whether it is in Norman or old Latin, but on referring to the book in the Rolls office, I find it is in Roman, and in fact it is very expensive to get copies of this charter for individuals, for I understand, that a copy will cost 20*l.* out of the Rolls office, and also in the Auditor-general's office.

When you say that it is not accessible to the citizens at large, you mean that it is only accessible in that way?—Only in that way.

How came you to make your application to Mr. John Allen?—As the town clerk, in order to ascertain whether this was the charter or not.

But Mr. Allen has not acted for many years as town clerk?—I believe he has.

Where did you apply to him, at what place?—At his own house.

Did

Mr. John Peters. (21 May.)

Did you ever apply at the town clerk's office?—I did ask in the town clerk's office, and they appeared to know nothing about it; but it certainly was a clerk I asked.

Do you understand it to be the duty of the town clerk to furnish you or any other person that chooses to ask for it, with a copy of the charter?—I do not understand that to be the case.

Then in what capacity or in what expectation was it, that you made that application to Mr. Allen?—As a householder of Dublin, in order to ascertain whether I was perfectly correct or not, the difficulty of obtaining information being so great.

Are you a freeman of the city of Dublin?—No; that is, I am not a member of the corporation of Dublin.

Do you conceive that by being a householder of Dublin you have any right to apply to the corporation for access to their charter?—I wished to know, as an individual paying taxes, what are the duties to be performed.

What was the request that you made to Mr. Allen?—To inform me as to the charter of the city of Dublin.

Did you ask him for a copy of the charter?—No.

Did you ask him for extracts from it, or what was the request you made to him?—I went to him for the purpose of ascertaining whether I was perfectly right in fixing on this charter, inasmuch as the difficulty of obtaining information in Dublin is so great. Now, that I am perfectly right, I am satisfied, from the circumstance that the history of Dublin written by Warburton, Dr. Whitelaw, and Dr. Welshall, quote the charter of James the 2d before-mentioned, as being the charter under which the corporation this moment derive, as it makes them a new corporation.

Mr. Isaac Stewart, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

WHAT is your situation in the city of Dublin?—I am a merchant.

How long have you resided in the city of Dublin?—Nearly twenty-seven years.

Are you a member of the chamber of commerce of the city of Dublin?—I am; I am one of the council of twenty-one of the chamber of commerce.

Have you of late paid any particular attention to the subject of the local taxation of the city of Dublin?—I have.

What circumstances have led you to pay particular attention to the subject?—The declining state of the trade of Dublin; the depression in house property, and also the increase of direct and indirect charges.

Has the increase of those charges been considerable?—Very considerable.

Are you able to give the Committee any general view of the total amount of the local taxation in the city of Dublin for one year?—Yes, I can; I have here a paper which I made out with as much care as I possibly could, from the documents that were within my reach.

What documents were those?—Parliamentary reports and returns made to orders of the House of Commons.

What other documents?—Some of them I had an opportunity of knowing from my particular line of trade, and others were obtained from individuals, conversant with the several subjects.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

A General Statement of One Year's direct and indirect Local Taxes, levied and collected from the Householders of the City of Dublin; furnished by the Committee appointed to investigate and report thereon.

Dublin, March 3, 1823.

Whom assessed and received by.	USES AND PURPOSES.		AMOUNT.	OBSERVATIONS.
			£. s. d.	
Paving Board - -	Paving, lighting, and cleansing, &c. Tax - -		45,965 – –	Taken from the Parliamentary returns, and Board's accounts, on an average of 11 years.
City Corporation -	* Grand Jury Cess, Prisons, &c. - - - - -		*27,515 – –	Parliamentary return for 1821.
D° - - -	* Pipe Water, and Metal Main Taxes - - - -		*22,200 – –	From Parliamentary returns, and the Corporation accounts, on an average of 13 years.
Police Establishment - - -	* POLICE TAX:	£. s. d.		
	Fees and fines from divisional offices	653 8 4	- - -	These four charges are taken from the returns to the Commissioners for auditing the Public Accounts for 1820.
	Figure fines, penalties on carriages, &c.	618 13 –		
	Licences to publicans, pawnbrokers, &c.	6,627 – –		
	Carriage tax, &c. - - - -	4,672 17 8		
	Watch and house tax - - -	8,637 19 8	- - -	The Watch Tax from the Parliamentary returns, on an average of 7 years. This establishment has also a government grant of £.28,166. 13. 4. per year.
			*21,209 18 8	
	WIDE STREET TAXES:			
Wide Streets Commissioners -	Charges on coals imported - -	12,595 – –	- - -	From Parliamentary returns.
	House card tax - - - - -	672 – –	- - -	D°, on an average of 7 years.
	Club tax - - - - -	256 – –	- - -	- D° - d°.
	*Wide Street house tax - - -	6,249 – –	- - -	- D° - d°.
			19,772 – –	
Governors Foundling Hospital -	Foundling Hospital Tax - - - - -		7,673 – –	- D° - d°.
Rector - - - -	Ministers Money - - - - - -		8,000 – –	- D° - d°.
Churchwardens -	Parish Cess - - - - - - -		12,000 – –	By computation from the best data.
	Amount of the direct taxes - - - £.		164,334 18 8	
Lord Mayor and Corporation -	FEES * - - - - - - - -		- - -	By computation.
	Fees on charges, wind, 6*d.* on shipping	150 – –	- - -	An order from the House of Commons has been obtained for these three charges.
	Fees or charges on coals and merchant vessels - - - - - -	1,846 – –		
	Fees to guild of merchants - -	8,895 – –		
	Fees, &c. on markets - - -	6,408 – –	- - -	These sums are made up from the best practical sources of information.
	D° - on bakers - - -	540 – –		
	D° - on showmen - - -	200 – –		
	Courts of civil jurisdiction - -	4,269 – –		
		22,308 – –		
	Sheriffs fees on civil bill suits - -	4,135 – –	- - -	From the Parliamentary returns.
	Gaoler's fees - - - -	2,211 – –	- - -	- D° - d°.
	Secretary to the grand jury, fees -	256 – –	- - -	computation.
			*28,910 – –	
	Royal Exchange - - - - - -		388 – –	
	Corn Exchange - - - - - -		1,552 – –	
* Ballast Board -	For improving the port, walls, lights, &c. - -		35,665 – –	Part Parliamentary return, and part computation.
Commissioners Dunleary -	Harbour - - - - - - - - -		8,295 – –	D°, Parliamentary return.
	Amount of indirect local taxes - - £.		74,810 – –	
	TOTAL Amount of the direct and indirect Local Taxes, per year - - £.		239,144 18 8	

N. B.—Those items marked thus (*), are in the hands of and managed by members of the corporation; making together the sum of £.99,834. per annum.

From a detail of the coal trade, annexed, it will appear that the city and vicinity of Dublin pay £.181,039. 8. 8. per year, more than any other city in the United Kingdom, wherein a similar quantity of coal is used.

The Committee, in making the calculation of the abovementioned amounts, have taken an average of a number of years, from authentic documents, parliamentary returns, or from such practical information as could be procured, so as to enable them to make out a report as nearly correct as their sources of information would admit of.

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(21 May.)

Can you put in a general statement of the local taxes of the city of Dublin for one year?—I can; the account which I have delivered in is for an average of years, but I have here an account that I can put in, which is made up from one year.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

ONE YEAR'S direct and indirect Local Taxes on the City of Dublin.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	OBSERVATIONS.
Paving Board - - - -	-	-	-	38,995	–	–	Parliamentary return.
Foundling Hospital - - -	-	-	-	7,673	–	–	D°.
Ministers Money - - - -	-	-	-	8,000	–	–	D°.
Parish Cess - - - - -	-	-	-	12,000	–	–	Computation.
* Pipe Water and Metal Main -	-	-	-	* 21,174	–	–	Parliamentary return.
* Police Establishment - -	-	-	-	* 20,829	–	–	D°.
Wide Streets:							
On coal - - - - -	12,595	–	–				
Card tax - - - - -	846	–	–				
				13,441	–	–	D° 10th Report.
House tax - - - -	-	-	-	5,385	–	–	
Club tax - - - - -	-	-	-	256	–	–	
* Grand jury cess - - -	-	-	-	* 27,515	–	–	D° see warrants.
Ballast office - - - -	-	-	-	35,665	–	–	Part Parliamentary return, part computation.
Dunleary - - - - -	-	-	-	8,295	–	–	Parliamentary return.
* Lord Mayor and Corporation:	-	-	-	-	-	-	By computation.
Fees on shipping - -	150	–	–	-	-	-	An order of the House of Commons has been obtained for and respecting these three charges.
D° on coals - - -	1,846	–	–				
Guild of merchants - -	8,895	–	–				
On markets - - - -	6,408	–	–	-	-	-	These sums are made up from the best practicable sources of information.
Bakers, &c. - - - -	540	–	–				
Fees to showmen - -	200	–	–				
Courts of civil jurisdiction -	4,269	–	–				
				* 22,308	–	–	
* Sheriffs fees on civil bill suits -	-	-	-	4,135	–	–	Parliamentary return.
* Gaolers fees - - - - -	-	-	-	2,221	–	–	D°.
* Secretary to grand jury, sundry fees - - - - - -	-	-	-	256	–	–	Computation.
Royal Exchange - - - -	-	-	-	388	–	–	Parliamentary return.
Corn Exchange - - - -	-	-	-	1,552	–	–	D°.
			£.	230,088	–	–	

N. B.—Those items marked thus (*), are in the hands of and managed by members of the corporation, making a sum of £. 98,348. per annum.

From a detail of the coal trade, it will appear that the city and vicinity of Dublin pays £. 181,039. 8*s.* 8*d.* more than any city in the United Kingdom, wherein a similar quantity of coal is used.

What year does this apply to?—They are not all taken from one year, but I believe they are mostly from the year 1821.

To what particular branch of the local taxation have you felt it your duty to pay your particular attention?—The subject of coals was the first that attracted my particular attention.

Have you confined your attention to the charges on coals, or applied it generally to port charges?—The port charges on all descriptions of trade, in order to show that the charges affecting the article of coals constitute the principal amount of the tonnage of the port of Dublin.

Have you made out any calculation of the charges to which coals are subject in the city of Dublin?—I have.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(21 May.)

Can you give that in to the Committee?—I can give it into the Committee taken as correctly as I could; there have, however, been some errors discovered since, but they are of no great extent.

Can you point out those errors to the Committee?—I can; the lord mayor's or guild of merchants' charge upon coals for measuring, is calculated at the quantity of tons for which duty was paid, and the measure of coals does not produce so much by a small port entry that is made on the article; the reason of the arises from the circumstance of the coals weighing more than the measure; sixteen tubs is computed to be a ton, and they weigh more than a ton, and are obliged to pay duty for more.

What difference would that make in the return which you have laid before the Committee; would it make any considerable difference?—It would not.

[*The witness delivered in the statement, which is as follows:*]

CHARGES on the Importation of Coal in the City of Dublin, in one year, ending 5th January 1822.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
GUILD OF MERCHANTS:						
For coal measurers for 267,470 tons, at 6*d.* per ton - -	6,686	15	–			
Actful measurers, one-half to merchants the other half to ship, at 6*d.* per ton - - - - - - - - -	6,686	15	–			
1,719 ships, for the use of two coal tubs, 3*s.* 9½*d.* each ship -	325	17	10			
Fees reported to be paid by captains for leave to choose small tubs from 10*d.* upwards, computed at 1*s.* each - - -	85	19	–			
A heaped half barrel of coals, valued at 2*s.* from each ship -	171	18	–			
50,000 tons computed to be measured in each year from the dealers stores charged a second time, 6*d.* per ton - -	1,250	–	–			
Note.—The actful measurer in the hold is the only charge that does not belong to the Guild of Merchants, or to any individual belonging to the corporation; but the whole sum is consequent upon and emanating from its being obligatory on the seller to deliver by measure instead of by weight.				15,207	4	10
LORD MAYOR.						
1,719 ships, as 14/5½ - - - - - - - -	1,242	13	10½			
Suppose 1,000 ships in coal trade to invoice once a year, reported to be for a friary at Clontarf, at 1/7½ each - - -	81	5	–			
BALLAST OFICE.				1,323	18	10½
1,219 ships, at 50 tons of ballast each, at 2/1 - - -	6,348	19	2			
Lights; suppose three Irish at ¾ and 2*d.* British per ton on 199,917 tons - - - - - - - - - -	2,481	12	2			
1,719 ships for 2/2 on each prime and post entry - - -	372	9	–			
Northern and Isle of Man lights charged only twice a year, the former at ½ the latter at ¼ per ton, computed at 100,000 tons, at 2½*d.* British - - - - - - - - -	1,128	9	1			
On the report of each ship 2/2 - - - - - -	186	4	6			
Quay walls, 1*d.*; Dublin Harbour, 6*d.*; 199,917 tons at 7*d.* -	5,830	18	3			
Suppose 500 ships obliged to pay for pilot without taking one, at 20/. - - - - - - - - - - -	500	–	–	16,848	12	2
GREENWICH HOSPITAL:						
Hospital bill, 2/1 on 1,719 ships paid twice - - - -	-	-	-	358	2	6
WIDE STREETS:						
Per their return to Parliament - - - - - - -	-	-	-	12,595	7	3
DUNLEARY HARBOUR:						
1,719 prime and post, 1/1 each; on invoice of vessel, 2/2; for anchorage and shipping, 8/1½; further bond, 2/2; in all making 14/7½ - - - - - - - - - - -	1,256	–	4½			
Outvoice of each collier, 4/4 - - - - - - -	372	9	–			
199,917 tons, tonnage duty at 2*d.* per ton British - - -	1,804	16	1½	3,433	5	6
The foregoing, exclusive of duty to the crown, 1/9 Irish per ton, and bond - - - - - - - - - -	24,334	15	–	49,766	11	1½
Freight, computed at 8*s.* on 267,470 tons - - - - -	106,988	–	–	131,322	15	–
£.				181,089	6	1½

	£.	s.	d.
Duty to crown - - - - - - -	24,334	15	–
Local charges - - - - - - - -	49,766	11	1½
	£. 74,101	6	1½

Can

Mr. Isaac Stewart

(21 May.)

Can you state what the duty on coal was in the year 1800?—Yes.

What was it by the ton?—It was by the measured ton, 10½ *d.*

In virtue of what statute was that?—By the 40th of George 3, chapter 4.

What provision does the sixth article of the Union make with reference to coal?—The words of the Act are these; "And Coals on importation into Ireland from Geat Britain shall be subject to burthens not exceeding those to which they are now liable."

To what duties have coals been subjected by the statutes passed subsequent to the Union?—By the 45th George 3, chapter 18, section 8, the duty is doubled.

Have there been any other alterations made by the legislature, either by augmenting the duty or altering the mode of measurement, which had the effect of increasing the charge?—There has.

Have the goodness to state what that alteration is?—By the 46th of George 3, chapter 87, section 63, power is given to the commissioners of Customs to charge coals by weight, and not by measure, and this has had the effect of increasing the duty.

Can you state how that has had that effect, and to what extent?—The commissioners of Customs have charged 208 lbs. upon every sixteen half barrels of coals coming from Cumberland and Swansea, and 160 lbs. upon Preston, Liverpool, and Chester; 144 lbs. on Troon, 240 on Glasgow, and 128 on Irvine.

What are the post entries on Saltcoat's coals and on Ayr coal?—On Saltcoat's, there are no post entries, 16 barrels are computed to a ton; on Ayr, they are under the ton 16 lbs.

Did this new regulation cause any other increase of burthen connected with the Customs department?—Yes, it did; and there are several Acts of Parliament affecting the shipping carrying coal, and on the entries.

What are they; have not they created the prime and post entries?—They have; and on both those entries there are charges.

Are those additional charges for Light and Dunleary Harbour charges?—Yes.

How did this new regulation of entering coal by weight, and not by measure, render the prime and post entries a necessary consequence?—The quantity, from the regulation of the Custom's department, could not be ascertained until after the discharge; they required prime entry from the vessels invoicing and paying duty for the quantity mentioned in the cocket.

But would not that entry have been equally necessary, whether the duty was charged by measure or by weight?—Certainly.

Then in point of fact, that alteration has not caused their additional charge?—Certainly it has; because then the post entry was not necessary, the first entry being all that was required.

State what the principles of charge were before this alteration, and what since?—Previous to the regulation, for instance, in the year 1812, the brig Maria, of Harrington, paid revenue and wide street duty on coals, in the port of Dublin, videlicet, 160 chaldrons, at 1¼ ton to the chaldron, is 200 tons, at 2 *s.* 9 *d.* per ton, say, 27 *l.* 10 *s.*; at the present time, the same vessel, with the same quantity of coals, say 160 chaldrons, equal to 273 ton, 4 cwt. 1 q. 4 lb. weight, at 2 *s.* 9 *d.* making 37 *l.* 17 *s.* 7 *d.* a difference of about 10 *l.* 7 *s.* 7 *d.* British, on her cargo in duty only, exclusive of other fees and charges.

Have you got the particulars of those two charges; the particular sums of which they are compounded?—I have mentioned the quantity they were then charged with, according to the system of calculation; a chaldron was the designation in the cocket, and the Customs computed it at a ton and a quarter.

But having stated in the second period of charge, that it is charged at 2 *s.* 9 *d.* of what sums is that sum of 2 *s.* 9 *d.* formed?—One shilling and nine-pence is the duty I have already described to the Crown, and one shilling to the Wide-street commissioners.

The statement you have made then, refers exclusively to the alteration in the charge, which has been produced by the alteration in the mode of measurement?—Certainly.

What are the light-house charges which have followed the alteration of the system?—The light-house charge has been increased by several Acts; it now is 2 *s.* 2 *d.* on each prime and post entry; the Northern and Isle of Man lights are charged only twice a year; the former, I believe, at a halfpenny, and the latter at a farthing per ton; and on the invoicing of the ship, which is called the report, 2 *s.* 2 *d.*; the amount thus levied, in the year ending 5th January 1823, was

6,867 *l.*

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(21 May.)

6,867 *l.* 18 *s.* 1 *d.* as stated by the officer of Customs, upon a personal application to him; and as this sum is nearly double the amount stated in a return to the House of Commons, for the year ending 5th January 1822, it may be right to explain that that return did not include the petty charges or fees upon entries, which in fact are not controlled by the examinator of Customs.

Are the Dunleary charges a perpetual charge, or only a temporary charge, to expire at a given time?—I have not looked into the Act so as to be able to answer that question.

Is not there a further charge of two-pence upon the register tonnage of each ship laden with coal for Dunleary?—There is two-pence for Dunleary; and in reply to the former question, I am aware that there is a sum of money borrowed from government for the purpose of building Dunleary, and this tax, together with the other tonnage duties upon the trade, is to remain on the city till that is liquidated.

Is there not a charge for a bond to be executed also?—There is.

What is the amount of that?—Ten shillings British; there are various other levies for Dunleary, of which I beg leave to hand in a schedule; these charges are considered vexatious as well as oppressive.

		s.	*d.*
" Upon each	entry of goods - - -	1	6
—	invoice - - - - -	2	–
—	outvoice - - - - -	2	–
—	bond for duty - - -	2	–
—	d° for master and mate - -	7	6
—	certificate for d° - - -	7	6
—	ship for anchorage - -	7	6
—	bill of view or store - -	2	6
—	licence to navigate - -	10	–
—	transire certificate - -	10	– "

I also beg leave to hand in an account of the port charges upon a vessel 226 tons burthen, together with copy of an outward entry upon the same vessel, which will show the various charges, under their several heads.

PORT CHARGES at Dublin, on the Brig "Wilson," 226 Tons; from New York, with a general Cargo.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
To Clerk of Ships Entries at Invoice, for Lord Mayor, Chapter and Guild - - - - - - - - - -				-	-	-	–	14	1
To Collector for Dunleary Asylum and Ballast Office - - -				-	-	-	–	14	7½
To River Pilot, 12 feet, at 1/. - - - - - - -				–	12	–			
To - d° - 2 tides, 2/8½. - - - - - - -				–	5	5			
							–	17	5
To Ballast Office:									
For Sea Pilotage, 12 feet, at 3/. - - - -	1	16	–						
For River Pilotage out, 13 feet, at 2/. - -	1	6	–						
				3	2	–			
For Tonnage Duty, 226 tons, 9 *d.* - - -	8	9	6						
For - d° - d° - „ - 2 *d.* - - -	1	17	8						
				10	7	2			
							13	9	2
To Clerk of Ships Entries, upon Outvoice - - - -				–	5	11½			
To Collector, upon Outvoice for Dunleary - - - - -				–	4	4			
To Collector, upon Passenger Bond, of which 2/2 for d° - -				–	13	–			
							1	3	3½
To Collector, for light Duties at Ballast Office:									
Outwards.—Old Tonnage Duty, 2 *d.* p' ton - -	1	17	8						
Exchange - -	–	3	1						
				2	–	9			
Inwards.—Old Tonnage Duty, 2 *d.* p' ton - -	1	17	8						
New - - - d° - - 2 *d.* p' ton -	1	17	8						
Exchange on d° - -	–	6	3						
				4	1	7			
For Dunleary Asylum, 4 *d.* p' ton - - -				4	1	7			
Carried forward - - -				10	3	11	16	18	7

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(21 May.)

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Brought forward				10	3	11	16	18	7
To Collector for English light Duties:	£.	s.	d.						
Milford, 1 *d.* p' ton	1	17	4						
South Stack, ½ *d.* p' ton	–	15	10						
Smalls, 2 *d.* p' ton	3	15	4						
Bardsly, ¼ *d.* p' ton	–	4	9						
Exchange	–	5	11½						
	7	7	8½						
Skerries, 2 *d.* p' ton	3	15	4						
	11	3	–½						
Less, Repayment to certain Flags, to assimilate the Charges to those upon British Vessels	5	9	–	5	14	–½			
							15	17	11½
To two Tidewaiters, inwards, during discharge of the cargo, 20 days, at 2/8 ½. each for board				5	8	4			
To one Tidewaiter, outwards, during the period of loading, 20 days, at 2/8 ½.				2	14	2			
							8	2	6
						£.	40	19	–½

The charge for tidewaiters is unknown in England; it was discontinued in Ireland when fees in the Customs were abolished there, and the tidewaiters received an increased salary as compensation, but subsequently the charge has been revived with impunity.

Exclusive of the above *direct* charges to which vessels are liable in Dublin, there are many imposts upon ships in particular trades, for instance timber and coals; and exclusive of all these charges the *indirect* levies are extremely vexatious, witness the annexed copy of an outward entry recently passed, by which it will appear, that although the duty to the Crown, upon this entry amounts to only one shilling and ninepence; the *indirect* charges amount to one pound nine shillings and threepence. When it is recollected that there are numerous *shippers*, and consequently many of these *outward* entries per each vessel, and a much greater number of *consignees*, and consequent *inward* entries for inward cargoes, it will appear that these charges amount in the aggregate, to a very large sum annually.

Copy of Outward Entry.

Dublin, 30th January 1823.

Outwards.—The " Wilson," Britton, for New York.

Jaˢ Jameson & Co.

			s.	d.
One puncheon of Whiskey, containing one hundred and thirty-nine gallons, for drawback, value	£.17 10*s.*	Duty	1	9
		Exchange	–	1
			1	10

Charges of entry.

	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
For Dunleary Asylum, ballast office, &c. upon entry			–	5	11½
Do - do - upon cocket			–	4	4
Do upon export board	2	2			
Stamp for do.	10	10			
			–	13	–
Dunleary on debenture paper	2	8½			
Stamp for do.	3	3			
			–	5	11½
		£.	1	9	3

Is there any, and what further charge, under the authority of the ballast board, for pilotage?—There is.

Can you inform the Committee how much that charge amounts to upon the tonnage, or upon the number of sail?—It is regulated by the draught of water, so much per foot.

What rate does it amount to, or how much does it produce, as applicable to the coal trade of the city of Dublin?—By the ballast office accounts it appears that last year, ending the 5th of January 1823, the pilotage of ships from sea was 3,026 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 *d.* and the pilotage of ships up and down the river was 644 *l.* 4 *s.* 3 *d.*; but of those the ballast office had not kept any separate account how much of that sum was paid by coal ships, and how much by other ships.

Have you been able to make any calculation how much is paid by the coal ships?—In this account which I handed in, I computed it at only 500 *l.* a year; but this is only a charge made upon ships, without any service whatever being rendered on that account, because the practice lately pursued by a number of masters of vessels, in consequence of the high price charged for ballast, was to take in

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(21 May.)

in limestone ballast, which they bought, and whenever that was done the ballast office insisted upon the ship taking a pilot, or if they did not take one, they were obliged to pay a certain sum of money in lieu of it; what that precise sum was I cannot exactly say. I beg leave to hand in a schedule of the charge at Dublin for ballast, as compared with the charge at London.

CHARGE AT DUBLIN:

	s.	d.	
To British ships - - -	1	6	per ton.
Foreign d° - - - -	2	6	—

AT LONDON:

	s.	d.	
To Coal ships - - - -	1	—	per ton.
British ships - - -	1	3	—
Foreign ships - - -	1	7	—

and the distance which the ballast is carried at Dublin is not one third of that at London.

Do you conceive any advantage to be derived to the trade of Dublin from the pilots provided by the ballast board?—Yes, I do.

Do you think that advantage is procured at too high a money price?—No, I think not.

Then, with respect to the charge for pilotage, you do not conceive that the public have any reason to complain?—The general opinion is, that the pilots are not sufficiently remunerated, and that they even were not supplied with boats such as they ought to be supplied with, they are not any thing like so good as the pilot boats at Liverpool; and I will beg leave to mention a circumstance that occurred last winter with respect to myself; a vessel coming from St. Andrew's, with timber, and bound for Belfast, which had sprung a leak at sea when near Dublin, the master found it necessary to run for that port; the ship came into Dublin harbour about ten o'clock in the morning, but could not find a pilot; no pilot boat being in the bay as there ought to have been, in consequence she was stranded.

Have you made any comparison of the amount of charges under the authority of the ballast board, to which the trade of Dublin is subject?—Yes, I have.

Have you made any such comparison as between the port charges of Dublin and the port charges of Belfast?—I have.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

TRADE OF BELFAST, 1821.

	Ships.	Tons.	Amount.	Rate of Charge.
			£. s. d.	d.
Foreigners - - -	17	2,999	36 15 3	2 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{2303}{2999}$
Natives - - - -	525	62,491	505 19 —	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{48275}{62491}$
Colliers and Coasters	991	71,005	399 5 9	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{28291}{71005}$

TRADE OF DUBLIN, 1821.

	Ships.	Tons.	Amount.	Rate of Charge.
			£. s. d.	s. d.
Foreigners - -	30	5,885	438 15 —	1 8
Natives - - - - -	958	91,144	3,417 18 —	— 11
Colliers - - - -	1,719	199,917	4,997 18 6	— 7
Coasters - - - -	694	29,934	748 7 —	— 7

From

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(21 May.)

From what document did you prepare this return?—From a document I procured from Belfast, signed by the Belfast master, and from another document I received from the Ballast-office at Dublin.

To what purposes are the ballast rates of Belfast applied?—To maintaining the harbour, and to provide pilots and ballast for the shipping.

To what purposes are the ballast rates of Dublin applied?—To the same purposes.

Are you able to inform the Committee, whether there are, or are not, very extensive works carrying on for the improvement of the port of Dublin which are not carrying on in the port of Belfast?—Yes, there are.

Does not that circumstance in itself account for a higher rate of duty in Dublin than at Belfast?—When those charges were originated, the present works that are now going on in Dublin, were not in contemplation.

What are the works that are now going on?—Building a wall, called the great north wall.

Is that a very expensive work?—Very expensive, indeed. I am not prepared to inform the Committee what the actual expense may be, but according to my judgment, it will cost at least 200,000 *l.* exclusive of an annual charge to keep it in repair for ever hereafter.

Have you any document which will enable you to inform the Committee, what the debt charged upon the ballast board is?—It is 81,600 *l.*

Had that debt amounted to so much as 81,600 *l.* at the time they undertook this additional work which you suppose will cost 200,000 *l.*?—When they undertook the work, the debt, by the paper which I hold in my hand, being a return made by that board to Parliament, appears to be 57,100 *l.*

Do you conceive the trade of the city of Dublin would be more likely to be benefited by a reduction of the charges that are now made, or by the prosecution and execution of the great public works?—I think the trade would be more benefited by a reduction of the charges, than by any advantage likely to be derived from the building of the north wall, which is considered by every person to be an experimental work, and not likely to have any effect whatever in deepening the harbour from the Pigeon House up to the city; it is expected that it will have a tendency to create a greater depth of water over the bar.

When was the ballast board of Dublin constituted, and by what authority?—By the 26th of George the 3d, chapter 19.

What are the powers that are vested in the ballast board by that Act, with regard to filling up vacancies in their body?—The surviving members have the power of filling up vacancies.

Is there any control exercised over them, as to the nomination of new members?—None that I know of, except a provision, which I believe exists, that the Lord Lieutenant and privy council must be informed of the nomination, and has the power to send them to a new election, but I believe it never has been exercised.

Are the rates that they are authorized to impose upon the trade, and the fines, and the power of borrowing money, subject to any limit?—None; on looking over the Act I see there are no bounds whatever.

Was there any effort made by the ballast board to obtain a knowledge of the general opinion of the merchants in Dublin, with regard to the great north wall which they are now undertaking?—Not any; had the citizens of Dublin been aware of the circumstances of the funds of the board, at the time they commenced this experimental work of the north wall, I am quite satisfied from what I have heard since, that the citizens would have petitioned the House of Commons against it, but the prevailing opinion in the city was, that this board had a vast sum of money lying by them, which they were bound to expend upon some works for the improvement of the harbour.

Whereas the fact was, that they were considerably in debt at the time?—Yes.

Do you know under what authority the sum of 358 *l.* appears as paid to Greenwich hospital?—No, I do not.

Is there any particular expense connected with the collection of that revenue?—There is a clerk kept in the Custom House of Dublin, for the purpose of collecting it.

In reference to light house fees, have you any reason to think that Dublin contributes more in proportion than most of the Irish ports?—Yes, I have.

On what account?—Because the tonnage of Dublin consists chiefly of coals.

How

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(21 May.)

How does that circumstance produce a higher proportionate charge in Dublin than is paid elsewhere?—The other ports have a greater trade in proportion to the quantity of coals they import.

How does the light house charge augment in proportion to the increased quantity of coal that is imported, as compared with other articles of commerce?—Because it is charged on the tonnage; it is no matter whether there is a cargo worth thirty or forty thousand pounds, or a cargo of 120*l.* or 130*l.*; they are subject to the same rate upon their respective tonnage.

Can you state the total quantity of coals imported into Ireland, in the year 1821?—651,909 tons.

How much did Dublin import?—267,470.

What was the whole tonnage in Ireland?—926,631 tons, in 1821, and the tonnage of Dublin in 1821, was 320,995; it therefore appears, that Dublin contributes about one-third of the whole expense of light-houses round all Ireland.

Then you mean to suggest, that as the trade of Dublin comprehends a great proportion of the trade of Ireland, and as the trade of Dublin consists chiefly in coal vessels, or to a considerable degree, the charge for light-houses falling with peculiar severity upon the coal vessels, falls heavier on the trade of Dublin than on the trade of Ireland generally?—Yes, I do.

Are there not charges imposed upon the people of Dublin, on the coals consumed in the city, for the purpose of making wide streets and improving the city?—There are.

Can you state how much that amounts to annually?—It amounts to 12,595*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.*

Is that exclusive of parliamentary grants and charges?—It is exclusive of all charges paid, and parliamentary grants.

Is it exclusive of the grant from Parliament, is it altogether raised by a tax upon coals?—That part of the income of the commissioners of wide streets is altogether raised by a tax upon coals.

Jovis, 22° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

Mr. Isaac Stewart, again called in; and Examined.

HOW are the Wide-street commissioners constituted?—I believe the first board formed, had a power to fill up vacancies as they occurred, and the surviving members of the board have uniformly exercised this power; I have looked into the Act of Parliament, but I cannot trace what authority government have on the occasion; I am, however, inclined to think they have a veto in the same manner as in the ballast office.

Do you know how often it is necessary for the members to attend annually?—No, I do not; I understand they are disqualified by non-attendance, but then they may and actually do elect the same persons over again.

Have they the power of borrowing money on the security of the tax?—I find they have a power of borrowing money on the security of the tax.

Do they borrow now at all?—They have a power by the 23d and 24th of George 3d, chapter 31, section 2, to borrow to any extent.

Do they do so now?—I am not aware what they are doing at present; they have also a power in another Act, the 47th of George 3d, chapter 74, section 30, to mortgage taxes that the grand jury are authorized to levy, but not exceeding 100,000*l.*; I am, however, unable to inform the Committee what sum of money they have borrowed upon each of those securities; one is upon the house tax and the other is upon the article of coal, the particular sums on each are not set forth in their accounts they have furnished to Parliament.

You are not in possession then of the amount?—There is no document recently laid before the public, showing the exact amount of the debt.

What is the whole amount of the debt?—

[*The witness delivered in an account of the debt, which was read, as follows:*]

Debt

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(22 May.)

Debt of Wide-street Commissioners.

£.	s.	d.			£.	s.	d.
76,400	–	–	Four per cent	- - -	3,056	–	–
130,236	19	3½	Six d°	- - -	7,814	–	–
38,985	19	7	Government				
11,000	–	–	Ballast office				
10,579	12	7	W. Sweetman	- -	13,960	9	6
7,000	–	–	Assignees of Carrol				
274,202	10	5½					

Their powers are 24 G. 3. c. 31. sec. 2. power to borrow; and by 47 G. 3. c. 74. 30 D°; they had also a power by latter Act to mortgage the tax upon houses, as also their rents of ground.

It is generally understood that government is bound to the debenture holders for the payment of the interest of the two first sums of 76,400*l.* and 130,236 *l.* 19*s.* 3½*d.* but whether this really is the case or not, I am unable to give the Committee any positive information. There is in that account, a sum, to which I think it right to draw the attention of the Committee, namely, 38,985 *l.* 19 *s.* 7 *d.* which appears returned as due to the Treasury; we have been unable to get any satisfactory account from those commissioners; in the course of our exertions on the subject of the local taxation, I wrote a letter to Messrs. Sherrards the secretaries, for the purpose of knowing the amount of their debt, and whether there were any, and if any, what sinking fund; they returned me an answer, which I will take the liberty of reading to the Committee, which will enable the Committee to judge, whether the acts of this board are kept secret or not.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read, as follows:*]

" Sir, Blessington-street, 29th December 1822.

" We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th instant, requesting as one of the committee of St. Mary's parish, on the local taxation, certain information on the debt and funds of the commissioners of Wide streets.

" And in reply, we beg to acquaint you, we do not consider we would be warranted in complying with your request without a special order of the board, to whom, if you please, you can apply by letter; their next meeting will be on Friday the 3d January, meanwhile permit us to inform you, we conceive you will find all the information you require, particularly detailed in Parliamentary reports of the last session.

" We have the honour to be, Sir,
" Your most obedient humble servants,

" To Isaac Stewart, Esq." " *Tho^s & D. H. Sherrard.*"

Witness.—I afterwards wrote to the commissioners, requesting they would furnish me with this information, and I have not since obtained an answer.

Are you acquainted with the objects upon which this expenditure under the control of the Wide-street commissioners is made?—Yes; it is intended for making improvements in the city by widening the streets; part of the money is expended in the purchase of houses that have been valued; the principal part of the money levied from the public, is now expended in the payment of the interest of the debt; and from the statement that is now before the Committee, it shows that the whole tax (very likely) ere long, will not be sufficient to pay that interest.

Are you aware of a projected improvement under the sanction of the Wide-street commissioners for the opening of Dame-street?—The opening of Dame-street was spoken of a long time ago, but I am not able to give the Committee any information what is now doing about it.

The question referred to future improvements in Dame-street?—It is mentioned in their accounts, " to open the north side of Dame-street, 36,000*l.*"

Are you acquainted with the part of the city to which that improvement refers?—I am.

Do you think there is any public object connected with that improvement, which is equal to an expense of 36,000*l.*?—None whatever.

Do you think the health of the inhabitants of Dublin would be advanced by such

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

such an improvement?—I do not; the street is already as wide as almost any street in London or Westminster.

Having stated the amount of the debt, can you inform the Committee whether there is any sinking fund provided, or any prospect of this debt being paid off?—I believe there is no such thing as a sinking fund, nor any prospect whatever of the debt being paid off by means of the present income and taxes received by that board.

Have you made extracts from their accounts so as to enable the Committee to be aware what the amount of the interest of their debt is, and the amount of their revenue?—I have; on the one side I have stated the interest of the debt at 13,960*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.*; rents, 1,066*l.* 6*s.*; salaries, 662*l.* 10*s.*; law costs, 1,124*l.* 7*s.* 1½*d.*; advertising and stationery, 272*l.* 2*s.* 11½*d.*; contingencies, 20*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.*; those sums being added together, make 17,106*l.* 11*s.*; and the revenue upon the other side on coals, comes to 12,595*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.*; rents of ground, 800*l.* 12*s.* 3*d.*; club tax, 846*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.*; rents of houses, 1,144*l.* 5*s.* 7½*d.*; those sums added together make 15,386*l.* 14*s.* 10½*d.* leaving a deficiency of 1,719*l.* 16*s.* 1½*d.*

Having stated the rents of houses to be 1,144*l.* 5*s.* 7½*d.* are you able to inform the Committee what is the general rate of purchase of that property; supposing those rents were sold for the extinction of the debt, what would be their value?—Sixteen or sixteen and a half years purchase.

That would amount to about 31,118*l.* to 31,700*l.*?—Yes; in addition to the last answer, I have been informed, that some of those rents are mortgaged to persons who have lent them money, as security for part of the debt already mentioned; the ballast office lent them 11,000*l.* and they have got a mortgage as security.

Have you heard any complaints in the city of Dublin, with respect to the conduct of this board?—I have heard many complaints, owing to the practice of holding inquisitions on houses, and afterwards not taking them until after the lapse of many years; and their having a right to hold other valuations, or what are called inquisitions, at any time they think proper, whenever the value of the property becomes reduced, owing to the circumstance of a valuation being had; and it generally so happens, that property becomes greatly reduced after being valued; they then, after it has been greatly reduced by means of the first valuation having taken place, and liable to be taken down at any time, on their paying the sum which such premises have been, or may be valued at, thereby making the property conditionally that of the commissioners.

Have the cases to which you allude been of frequent occurrence?—Very frequent.

Do you consider that in point of fact, Dublin requires any additional expenditure of public money, for the improvement of the streets under the control of the Wide-street commissioners?—I think not; there might be some small alterations necessary, but no material or expensive ones; nor do I consider, upon general principles, that expensive works ought to be undertaken even for necessary improvements, unless the trade were such as to be capable of affording it, and I do not think the trade of Dublin is in that situation.

Having stated your impression that a deficiency in the funds of the commissioners is likely to take place, does any remedy occur to you, to provide for that contingency?—Yes; in the first place I will mention, that a saving might take place out of the present expenditure.

In what particulars?—Six hundred pounds might be saved out of the salaries.

How would you provide for the duties of the board, if you left only 62*l.* for salaries?—The commissioners have no salary; those are for officers, and I apprehend that if there is no business going forward, and if there are no expensive works going on, that it would be quite unnecessary to keep up an expensive establishment.

What other saving do you think practicable?—I think that 1,000*l.* might be saved on the law costs.

Those legal expenses chiefly accrue in the valuation of houses?—Yes; and for attending the juries.

Then it is by the cessation of the duties of the board that you contemplate the possibility of that saving being made?—Yes.

Is there any other saving which you think practicable?—Yes; in the advertising, stationery and contingencies, which appear now to cost 292*l.*; I compute that 119*l.* would be quite sufficient to answer this purpose; I will beg leave to mention further,

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

further, that it requires little arithmetical knowledge to show, that were the security good, the interest of the present debt might be greatly reduced by means of borrowing at 4 or 5 per cent, as much money as would pay off the 6 per cent debt; this being done, the saving would be equal to one-sixth or two-sixths of the interest of that part of the out-standing debt, being 130,206 *l.*

Is not government security for all the debt?—Yes, I believe so; this would produce from the lowest calculation, if borrowed at 5 per cent, a saving of 1,302 *l.* per year, and on the greatest, a saving of 2,604 *l.* per year; and were the old debt subjected to the operation of a sinking fund, which might be confidently looked to, provided government would give up the claim for the balance of 38,985 *l.* which I rather think was granted under some peculiar circumstances, and for some specific purpose for improvements about the castle, more for the accommodation of government, than for any permanent utility afforded to the city by this particular expenditure.

What course would you suggest for providing for the ultimate extinction of the debt itself; where does the debt due to government appear?—I observe it in a return to Parliament for 1816; I cannot now particularly mention where to find it; I found it somewhere in a printed paper as a return to Parliament, where they state their debt to be 245,622 *l.* 18 *s.* 10 *d.*; and I observe in their accounts returned to Parliament in 1822, that they owe several sums in addition to that just mentioned namely, 11,000 *l.* to the ballast office; 10,597 *l.* to William Sweetman; and 7,000 *l.* to the assignees of Coote and Carrol.

Does any mode occur to you by which the ultimate payment of the debt might be provided for?—I have a plan which I intended to suggest to the Committee on the subject of paying off this debt; but that was on the supposition of all those taxes continuing upon the citizens, and that government would not interfere, to take off the duties on coals; in the event of government not interfering, and that this plan was adopted, there would be a sinking fund of about 4,400 *l.* a year.

Of what sums is that sinking fund composed?—Composed of the surplus after paying the interest.

Do you take credit in that for the continuance of the annual Parliamentary grant?—No, I do not.

If the Parliamentary grant were continued, and the saving that you have suggested made in the interest of the debt, and the rents which you have alluded to converted into cash, would there not be an ample provision made for the extinction of the debt?—Very ample; as by means of the saving of 4,400 *l.* commencing in 1824, it would be reduced in the year 1832 about 46,000 *l.*

Supposing there were a cessation of the duties of the Wide-street commissioners altogether, do you think that any public inconvenience would arise to the citizens of Dubin, from the cessation of those duties, and the application of the whole sum to the extinction of the debt?—I do not think there would be any.

Are you acquainted with the sums which have been levied from the merchants, under the authority of the ballast board, for the quay walls, west of Carlisle bridge?—I know there have been sums levied by the ballast office.

What is the name by which that tax has been designated?—The Anna Liffey house tax and foot tax, commonly called the Quay Wall tax.

Has that tax ceased?—No; it is continued upon all houses, waste grounds and gateways fronting the quays; but on houses not fronting the quays it is discontinued.

For what objects is that tax levied?—I cannot understand at present for what object it is levied, because it appears to me that there is no expenditure of any consequence, and still the tax is very considerable.

Are you aware of any balance being struck on the foot of this tax and transferred to any other account?—Yes, I am.

Will you inform the Committee of the particulars of that transaction?—The balance in favour of the public, in the last account furnished, was 3,249 *l.* 17 *s.* 2 *d.* and the expenditure for works in that year was only 467 *l.* 4 *s.* and salaries, annuities, contingencies, interest and tax collectors, comes to 577 *l.*

To what account was that balance transferred?—There appears to have been in the bank of Ireland, on account of the Anna Liffey cess, 254 *l.* 18 *s.* 6½ *d.*; ditto, account of Ballast office Foot tax, that is the Quay Wall tax, 68 *l.* 18 *s.* 4½ *d.*; due by the late Alderman Howison, 248 *l.* 7 *s.* 4 *d.*; advanced on account Whitworth Bridge, 50 *l.*; ditto ditto repairs of bridges, 1,266 *l.* 13 *s.* 6 *d.*; ditto, account of Queen's bridge, 1,360 *l.* 19 *s.* 3 *d.*; making a total of 3,249 *l.* 17 *s.* 2 *d.*

Mr.
Isaac Steuart.
(22 May.)

What was done with the 3,249 *l.*?—It was lent.

To whom was it lent?—To those different accounts that I have just mentioned; and the ballast office commissioners are also the commissioners for those works.

So that, in point of fact, those commissioners lent it to themselves, in other public capacities?—Certainly.

Is there any mode of re-transferring this to the credit of the public?—I suppose there is; I suppose it is in the power of those commissioners to dispose of it as they think proper.

Are you aware of any instances of hardship which occurred in consequence of an assessment under the House tax upon gateways or unprofitable grounds?—Yes, I have heard of some instances; one of which was a case where a man got property by the death of a relation, the arrears due upon it to the ballast office was 60 *l.*; the property not being worth so much he endeavoured to persuade them to take it to themselves, but they would not, and instituted a suit against him, he being a man of some substance, and I believe obliged him to pay the 60 *l.*; the ballast office are enabled, I understand, to do this by Act of Parliament, which renders taxes due to them not subject to the statute of limitations; it is considered like a rent-charge, and are not liable to the law respecting other taxes of the city.

What was the result?—I believe he was obliged to pay; I had a similar case myself; they called upon me for nine years arrears, for one half of a gateway on George quay.

Having stated to the Committee, that the charges in the port of Dublin for coal, are much higher than they are in other ports, are you able to inform the Committee what additional price they produce upon coal in Dublin, as compared with the ports of Drogheda, Dundalk, Newry and Belfast?—In Drogheda, Dundalk, Newry and Belfast, the prices of coal are generally from 16 *s.* 6 *d.* to 17 *s.* per ton, and in Dublin the usual price at the quay is about 21 *s.* to 22 *s.* per ton.

Is coal the fuel which is generally consumed by the people of Dublin, including the lower orders?—It is.

Is the consumption of coal very considerable in the public establishments, the breweries and distilleries and manufactories of the city of Dublin?—It is.

Have you any reason to imagine that the high price of coal operates as a discouragement to the promotion of manufactures in the city of Dublin?—I do consider it operates very materially; for instance, an establishment of moderate extent in the calico printing trade, will consume from 1,200 to 1,500 tons yearly; in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, the price at which such a quantity will be delivered to the manufacturer, does not exceed 7 *s.* per ton, and in Manchester 8 *s.*; whilst, in the immediate vicinity of Dublin, the price upon delivery is seldom less than 24 *s.* per ton; the disadvantages to which an establishment engaged in this branch of trade in Dublin, when compared with another, either in Glasgow or Manchester, is consequently and inevitably subject, will, in the particular case here stated, clearly amount to 1,000 *l.* per annum, a sum which in itself would be considered a very considerable yearly profit from a concern such as has been instanced.

Are there any charges for or on behalf of the corporation of the city of Dublin, as connected with the coal trade?—There are.

What are those charges?—The first charge is for the lord mayor, collected at the custom house.

Can you state the amount of those charges?—It appears by a return which I hold in my hand, that in three years the gross sum collected was 3,867 *l.* 4 *s.* 5 *d.*

For what time?—For three years.

Where is that duty collected?—At the custom house.

Are you aware under what authority that duty is collected?—I am not aware of any authority for its collection.

Do you know how that is applied?—Yes; it appears by a return signed by Edward Hammerton, the individual who collects it at the custom house.

Is he a public officer?—He is the clerk of ships entries, and cockets, he has been frequently asked by merchants under what authority he collects it, but he has never given any satisfactory explanation; I have asked him myself, and he said it was for the lord mayor and that the authority was in the charter; and he exercises the power of hindering ships from clearing out, unless those fees, &c. are paid.

Is not there an Act of Parliament for it?—They do not say in this report to Parliament that there is any Act of Parliament.

How

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.* (22 May.)

How is it appropriated?—510 *l.* 5 *s.* is Edward Hammerton's proportion, which is equal to about 13 per cent upon the gros sum.

Is that paid to Hammerton as a per centage upon collecting it?—The words made use of here are, paid to him under an arrangement of the corporation, for the collection of the charges on vessels discharging coals in the port of Dublin, has been consigned to the clerk of the ship's entries in the port at a per centage; the other appropriations are the sheriff's, 24 *l.* 15 *s.* 4¼ *d.*; the recorder's, 24 *l.* 15 *s.* 4¼ *d.*; water bailiff's, 1,746 *l.* 9 *s.* 1 *d.* Lord mayor, 590 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; for the corporation at large, shippage, 156 *l.* 0 *s.* 7 *d.* and anchorage, 814 *l.* 16 *s.* 6 *d.*

Is that the whole appropriation?—It is.

Does that include those which are styled chapter and guild?—It does.

How much are coal vessels charged each voyage?—They are charged 14 *s.* 5½ *d.* every voyage, and once a year, 1 *s.* 7½ *d.* additional.

Under what head is that charge made; is that included in any of the duties collected by Mr. Hammerton?—It is.

What is the 14 *s.* 5½ *d.*?—That is the manner in which Mr. Hammerton collects it.

Are you aware for what purpose the annual sum of 1 *s.* 7½ *d.* is charged?—I have been informed that it is charged for the purpose of burying the dead; it had formerly been contributed by captains of ships to a friary which was once at Clontarf, for burying the dead found drowned on the north Bull.

Does it continue to be appropriated for such purpose?—No, I believe not; I am sure it is not. There is no such friary in existence.

With respect to the charges for shippage and anchorage, are you aware of any public duties that are executed in return for any of those charges?—None whatever.

By whom are the buoys and the charges maintained; is it the ballast office?—The merchants and trade of Dublin support the ballast office, who has charge, under several Acts of Parliament, of all the quays, buoys, walls and harbours of Dublin, extending from Daltry on the south side to Balbreggan on the north side.

The labours of the ballast office are provided for by an additional charge?—They are.

Are you aware that any increase has been made under the head of any of those charges?—The charge of 1 *s.* 7½ *d.* appears to have commenced in 1800 which was about the time I began business; and I never knew of any other charges than those already mentioned.

Are you aware of any duties for the benefit of the public which are performed by the water bailiffs?—No, I am not aware of any duty whatever for the benefit of the public.

Can you inform the Committee, what are the duties of that office?—They execute, like any other bailiffs in the city, warrants on the water.

Do not they find tubs and measures?—I never understood they did, until I saw the report on the table; there is generally no one to supply the coal tubs, but two men of the names of Oulton and Howard.

Can you inform the Committee, what are the charges made upon the coal trade of Dublin, under the authority of the guild of merchants?—They return in one year 6,763 *l.* 16 *s.* 4¼ *d.* as the amount.

Can you inform the Committee, whether any increase has taken place in the rates charged by the guild of merchants?—They have been perpetually increasing.

Will you state the sums, and the particulars of that increase?—I have seen a copy of a paper, purporting to be part of an affidavit made by Allen and Green in a suit.

Who are Allen and Green?—They are town clerks; they made it on the part of the corporation; and in this paper, which I understand to be part of their affidavit, they stated that it was 2 *d.* previous to 1794; it was then raised to 3 *d.* and in 1798 to 4 *d.* and since 1802 it has been 6 *d.* per ton.

Do you know by what authority that increase has taken place?—By the authority of the corporation.

The corporation of the guild of merchants?—Yes; supported by the court of conscience.

Have you ever known the payment of those fees resisted?—Yes, I have.

Were there any legal steps taken in consequence of that resistance?—There were, by several individuals.

Mr. Isaac Stewart. (22 May.)

What was the result?—A man of the name of Russell instituted a suit, which was argued in the court of King's Bench, before a full court, for three days; upon which occasion the court made several orders, one of them was to restrain the court of conscience from issuing a warrant for the recovery of a debt that had been contracted for the sixpence a ton, payable to the guild of merchants; there were two or three other orders respecting the issue intended to have been tried in a court of law.

Was it so tried?—No, it was not; Russell failed in circumstances, and in the mean time it never was tried; the guild of merchants formerly insisted on measuring coals going out of yards, and standing by while they were measured, and charging sixpence a ton on them; but this has been successfully resisted by the yard keepers, a short time since; I believe there has been a decision against coal-meters by a court of law, and it is now settled that they had no right to go into a yard; they have also demanded and exercised the power of going on board ships where coals are delivering, the property of individuals, imported for their own use, and of standing by to see them measured, or rather, in order to make the charge of sixpence a ton.

What duties are performed in return for those charges made by the guild of merchants?—There is sometimes a coal measurer on board the ship, and sometimes not; I have frequently taken notice of it; I have had several cargoes myself, and my business leads me very often to go down the quay when I am shipping corn; and since I commenced the inquiry into the local taxation, I particularly noticed two colliers, which were working in the morning in the absence of the measurer; I asked where the coal measurer was, and the people on board said he was gone to his breakfast; I went again on board in the evening the same ship, and finding the ship still at work, in the absence of the measurer, I asked where the coal measurer was, and they told me he was in the cabin with the captain.

Are the Committee to understand that those measurers are officers under the guild of merchants, claiming an exclusive right of measuring all the coals in the port of Dublin?—Yes.

Are the Committee to understand, that for the exercise of this right, they claim a fee which has been several times raised on their own authority?—Certainly.

Can you inform the Committee, whether any inconvenience would be felt by the trade or by the public, if all importers were allowed to sell their coals free from all such interference?—I think there would be no inconvenience whatever, and that there would be very great advantage derived to the public; I conceive if the merchants had liberty, and the public in general, to take out coals as they thought proper, either by weight or by measure, that it would create a saving of about 12,000*l.* a year to the citizens of Dublin, and be the means of affording very considerable advantage to all consumers.

From what circumstances do you conceive that such a saving would be a consequence of the alteration of system which you propose?—Because I consider measuring a bad method of ascertaining the quantity of an article so bulky as coal, and it is attended with an expense of nearly 14*d.* per ton, whilst if coals were weighed, the cost would not be more than 2*d.* and this difference would be a saving to the inhabitants of Dublin, of from 12,000*l.* to 13,000*l.* annually, exclusive of the frauds so frequently and so easily practised at present, but which would so easily be checked if coals were sold by weight.

Then does your observation solely refer to the alteration of selling by weight in place of by measure?—No.

What other circumstances then do you rely on, in order to produce this proposed saving?—I rely on the imperfect manner in which the measure is now made; coals are broken in order to make them measure lighter, besides the breaking of the coals injures the quality; I further beg to notice, that the trade employ artful fillers, a description of men, who are very clever at such work, filling the tubs with a great deal of art, so that the quantity that is supposed to be in the measure, is really not in it; in explanation, I beg to mention an instance; Whitehaven coals ought to pay according to a trial made by the custom house, 208 lbs. more than a ton; I made an experiment upon a ton of coals, and it produced only 77 lbs. thus showing there is duty paid to the crown upon 131 lbs. of coals, more than is really delivered to the consumer, of course he pays for so much more than he receives, and is defrauded the difference.

Have you ever heard any complaints made, as to the mode in which this power

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

of measuring is exercised by the officers of the guild of merchants?—It is a very general subject of complaint in the city of Dublin.

Do you consider them to be impartial individuals, as between buyer and seller?—I cannot consider them in any other light, except that they do not appear to do their duty very correctly.

Can you inform the Committee, whether the practice of selling coals by weight has been adopted in any other, and what ports, in Ireland?—It has been adopted in Belfast.

Is that by statute?—No, by usage.

Has it been found beneficial at Belfast?—Very much so; at Dundalk, Limerick, and in Cork, it is altogether by weight; in latter port under an Act of Parliament.

Are you aware whether, in any of those other out-ports, there is any officer employed as between buyer and seller, corresponding to the master measurer and the coal measurers of the guild of merchants?—There was a measurer in Belfast, appointed by the corporation to measure, who charged a certain sum for his services; the distillers in Belfast refused to permit him on board their ships, or to measure the coals, and insisted upon taking them by weight; the corporation of Belfast, thereupon, were about to commence a suit against them, however, after some time spent in threatening, they ultimately gave up the contest, and for many years they the distillers have received their coals by weight.

Does the public at large receive coals by weight at Belfast?—As they think proper, either by weight or measure.

Is it so at Dundalk?—It is the same; the corporation there also attempted to dispute the right with a distiller, but ultimately surrendered their claim.

You are clear, in your judgment, that giving the public a power of purchasing by weight if they should so think fit, free from any interference of the guild of merchants, would produce in Dublin very considerable saving, and very considerable advantage?—I am quite satisfied that it would, and it is not only my opinion, but that of every other person; the meters are at present appointed by the guild of merchants, and they are of the lowest class of corporators, for instance, there is one man, now a meter of Dublin, of the name of Emmerson, who was found guilty of selling forged stamps and sentenced to transportation; he remained some time in confinement, his sentence was commuted, and I am now informed he is one of the master measurers.

How did he get out of gaol?—He staid some time in gaol, but was not transported; those measurers are obliged to pay a sum of money, I have been told, differently from 23 guineas to 32 guineas, upon getting their appointment.

To whom does that money go?—To the guild of merchants; they are also obliged to pay a further sum to persons of the names of Oulton and Howard; a further sum of 4*s.* 8*d.* on getting a ship, and it is no matter what the size of the ship may be, they are obliged to pay that sum for what they call booking; the way in which it is accounted for in their own accounts is as follows: inspector in 1776, bookings at 2*s.* 2*d.* per 192*l.* 8*s.*; book-keeper for the same, 192*l.* 8*s.*; ditto for messenger, 36*l.*; making a total of 420*l.* 16*s.* This is a charge which we have not included in the account in the sheet containing the gross local taxation, because it is a charge made by one class of corporators against the other; however, I would beg to draw the attention of the Committee to this fact, those measurers being obliged to pay so large a sum as this, they are thereby made dependent upon the captains of vessels for their support, and the captains being generally interested in the out come of the cargo, he therefore, as the seller, will naturally keep on good terms with the measurer, to defraud not only the public but the revenue.

Does the guild of merchants, or its officers, claim any right of entering forcibly on board ships, in order to measure the coals?—They do, and their officers have enforced their claims.

Are you aware by what law, or by what authority, they justify such a course of proceeding?—I never heard of any law or authority whatever, and on reading over their own account, I find they do not pretend to say there is any law on the subject.

Have not they enforced it by legal proceedings?—Never, that I have heard, except by the court of conscience.

What is the court of conscience?—It is a court held by the ex-lord mayor; they have authority to enforce sums as far as 40*s.* and in order to bring all those charges within the reach of 40*s.* I have been informed, and I have no reason to doubt it, when a vessel larger than 80 tons burthen was discharging coals, and it

Mr.
Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

appeared likely that the payment of the charge would be disputed, they changed the measurers, so as to keep their demand under that sum.

Is there not a duty charged for the use of coal tubs?—There is 3 *s.* 9½ *d.* paid at the coal office, to Oulton and Howard.

Is there not a demand also made of a certain quantity of coal?—There is.

How much?—A heaped half barrel of coals from every ship.

What is paid by the measurers to the guild of merchants?—I understand they have varied from time to time, but the highest I have heard them mention is 32 guineas, and the lowest 22 or 23 guineas.

Have you ever heard of a fee being paid by the captains of ships for leave to choose small tubs in preference to large ones?—I have; and I was unwilling to believe it for a long time; but since the present lord mayor came into office, he discovered on measuring a quantity of coals, that some bags were measure and some not; in consequence he seized the coals and took them away; the owner of the carts being a man of very excellent character, and very independent, followed his carts and begged the lord mayor would inquire into the affair to the bottom; he urged him to go to the ship and examine the tubs; accordingly the lord mayor accompanied this gentleman to the ship, he examined the tubs and found one of them correct measure, and the other not.

Were they both stamped?—Yes, I understand they were both stamped, and both corporation tubs; the lord mayor went further, he went to the yard where the tubs were kept, and on examining a number of them, he found some correct measure and some not; having heard of this occurrence, I went to the yard myself, where I saw the cooper in the act of putting in a new stave into the smaller tubs, in the form of a wedge, about an inch and a half broad at the top coming down to a point at the bottom, so as not to make it necessary to take out the bottom; it appeared evident that the tubs must have been made so from design, because they are made of strong oak, and have iron hoops inside as well outside; with respect to the large tubs; there has been a discovery made lately, the reason of this requires to be explained, a merchant, such as one in my situation in life, who does not follow the trade of retailing coals to housekeepers, when they get an occasional cargo, they usually sell them to a jobber, who, it would appear, can, if he chooses, get tubs larger than the quantity; I am induced to form this conclusion from my having been informed not long ago, at the clerk of the market's office, where I was upon other business, and where I saw some tubs that had been seized; one of them was a pint, another a quart, I think he said the third was near two quarts larger than the legal size.

Are the appointment and preparations of those artful measurers, great tubs and small tubs, all under the authority of the guild of merchants of the city of Dublin?—The man working in the hold of the ship as the artful measurer, has nothing to say to the guild of merchants at all.

Who appoints him?—He is a person hired by the captain of the ship, or owner of the cargo.

Who prepares those tubs?—I have always understood it was the guild of merchants; there is another matter I will mention with respect to the right of measuring; in the votes of the Irish House of Commons in 1695, which I beg to refer to, to show that at that time there was no such thing; there is in those journals a petition from protestant porters, complaining that papists were allowed to buy and carry coals; a variety of discussions had taken place, complaining of the conduct of those people that they had connived with the captains of vessels to defraud the inhabitants, and several Acts of Parliament passed upon the subject, but I can find no Act of Parliament whatever, which authorized them to go on board a ship, and insist on performing the duty, and I can find no Act of Parliament fixing any rate for themselves.

Are you free of the guild of merchants?—I am.

Do not you know there was a committee appointed by the guild of merchants, for the purpose of hearing and redressing the complaints that may be made of the coal measurers?—I heard there was a committee appointed by them, but what their duties are I do not know.

Did you ever know a coal measurer, when required by the buyer to do his duty, refuse it; or, if complained of to the coal committee, that they refuse to punish them for the neglect of duty?—No, I do not know, of my own knowledge, of any instance.

Have you ever known a complaint refused to be attended to?—No, I have not.

Do

Mr. Isaac Stewart. (22 May.)

Do not you know complaints are constantly made to the committee, and men are removed in consequence of them?—I know they are very often dismissed.

Is not it from misconduct and neglect of duty?—It is; I beg to mention a circumstance that has just come to my recollection; I was once at the guild of merchants, where I heard a discussion about the dismissal of a measurer who had misconducted himself; one person said, he had discovered that some coals going through the city, which had been measured by this measurer, contained little more than half the quantity there ought to be, upon which there was a motion made to re-instate him and forgive him this fault; it was carried; some one said they would try him once more; an alderman said he had been a good loyal man and they would forgive him for this time, and it was decided to do so.

Are you aware that they are sealed by sworn officers?—Yes, I am aware they are sealed by the clerks of the market, but the seal is only put upon one stave; the brand is only put upon one stave.

In case redress was refused by the coal committee, do you know of any instance of a complaint made to the guild on the quarter day, respecting the coal establishment, which has been refused to be attended to?—I very seldom attend the guild of merchants; in answer to a former question I would beg to state that I have read in a newspaper a reported account of a discussion that had taken place in the guild of merchants; Alderman Archer brought forward a complaint of the practice of keeping small tubs, and Alderman Nugent, the master of the guild, said he was making much ado about nothing, that it was only small tubs he was talking about.

You state that you have not been able to find out by what rate the sixpence a ton is levied for measuring; did you ever apply to the guild for information on that subject or for liberty to inspect their books?—Never; there is another complaint that the citizens make with respect to those measurers, that they are allowed to do it by deputy; for instance, I have been informed, that a Mr. Timothy Allen, one of the clerks of the guild of merchants is a master measurer, and that his duty is done by deputy, and that he gets what is called the best cast, that is, the largest ship; and that Mr. Oulton is also a master measurer, he does the duty also by deputy; there have also been many others mentioned to me who do the duty by deputy.

You mentioned that you thought the weighing of coals would be a great advantage?—Yes, that persons might have the option.

You have already stated, that they weigh more than they measure?—Some coals do and some not.

Do you know the weight of Whitehaven coals?—I tried one, which weighed 77 lbs. more than the 20 hundred.

Does a measured ton of Whitehaven coals weigh 21 hundred and 3 quarters?—No, it weighed only 77 lbs. more than the 20 hundred.

Have you the Maryport coal; how much did that weigh more?—I tried only one; all Cumberland and all Swansea coal are rated at the same; they are rated at 208 lbs. more than the 20 hundred.

What are the Maryport; is not the Maryport coal the worst description of coal imported into Dublin?—I believe not.

Are you aware that a ton of Maryport coal weighs nearly 200 weight more than measured ton of Whitehaven?—Yes, 208 lbs. if measured fairly; but I am aware that it weighs only 77 lbs. more as usually delivered.

If vessels laden with coal to Dublin, always sold the coals by weight, and that the vessel shipped water, would not the consumer have a great additional weight from that to pay for?—He would have to pay less than he does at present for the same quantity of coal.

Have not they found in Cork great frauds to arise from wetting coal?—From the enquiry I have made they have not, generally speaking; there have been some instances in which they have discovered it; but they can discover the fraud, I believe, of watering coals as readily as in any thing else.

Do you think they could discharge the coals sufficiently fast by weight?—I think they could, faster than by measure.

When there are six or eight vessels discharging one over another, which is often the case in Dublin, could they do it by weight?—They could, and to check it, it is within the reach and in the power of any housekeeper, because there is hardly any one that has not the power of weighing one hundred and a quarter weight, which would be the weight of a bag of coals, and any one can check that, but no one can check the measure, except by taking them to the clerk of the market, or being provided with a tub, and understanding how to measure, which very few are.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(22 May.)

Do you think there would be more facility in using deficient weights than measures; would there be more danger of weights being deficient?—No, I think not; I think there would be no danger whatever of the weights being deficient, no more than there is in corn or any thing else in the city of Dublin.

Then, on the whole, you think that the consumer would be better off if they were to pay by weight?—I think it would be a great advantage to all the trade.

Do they weigh coals in London; is it by weight they sell them in London?—I believe they sell both by weight and by measure in London, but their manner of measuring differs materially from the practice with us.

Veneris, 23° die Maii, 1823.

SIR ROBERT SHAW, BARONET,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Isaac Stewart again called in; and further Examined.

(23 May.) YOU have stated that the trade of Dublin is decreasing; can you state how much it has decreased between 1817 and 1822?—In respect to coals, I can. I can also, with respect to the general trade; the decrease in Dublin in 1822 as compared with 1817 is 36,445 tons of coal.

How was the relative proportion of the whole importation in Ireland within those years?—The whole decrease within those years was 61,971 tons.

Were there any principal trading towns of Ireland increasing during this period?—There were.

What is the comparative tonnage of Dublin compared with Cork and Belfast?—Cork imported in 1817, 88,894 tons, and in 1822, 100,120 tons, making an increase of 11,296 tons; and Belfast in 1817 imported 68,898 tons, and in 1822, 74,445 tons, making an increase of 6,067 tons; the comparative tonnage of the coal-trade of Belfast and Dublin in the year ending the 5th of January 1822, Belfast had 2,999 tons, Dublin 5,850 tons; of foreign shipping in same year, Belfast had 62,491 tons, and Dublin 91,144 tons; of natives, which includes all trade with England except colliers, Belfast had 7,005 tons of shipping with coals and coasters, and Dublin 229,851 tons of colliers and coasters; I make this statement in order to show the small difference there exists between the cross-channel and the foreign trade between Dublin and Belfast; Dublin not exceeding Belfast by more than about a third of the entire trade.

Has the duty on coals been reduced by any and what Acts in England?—It appears by a paper which I have extracted from reports furnished by the Commissioners for foreign trade, which I will beg leave to hand in, that the duty in Cheshire has been reduced by different Acts in 1814 and in 1817, two different periods.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

Brought coastwise from any port in Great Britain to London.	Brought coastwise from any port in England to another port.	From Great Britain to Wales, or any port in Wales.	
		From 12th December 1814, to 10th July 1817.	From 10th July 1817, to the present time.
	From 12th December 1814, to the present time.		Vide 57, Geo. 3, c. 96.
	s. *d.*	*s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*
Per ton of 20 cwt. -	7 6	4 –	– 9
Per measure the chaldron - -	9 4	6 –	1 –
Into London for the Royal Hospital	6 –	—	—
Cinders of pit-coal per chaldron -	6 –	6 –	6 –
Culm per chaldron	5 –	1 3	per cha. 2 per ton. 1½

Note:—By a report which I observed in a newspaper this week, it appears, that the duty on sea-borne coals in all ports in England, except London and Wales, is 6 *s.* per chaldron.

You

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(23 May.)

You have mentioned that the Wide-street Commissioners obtained part of the receipt by means of a house-tax levied by authority of the grand jury; can you give any information to the Committee how this money is levied and accounted for?—Yes, I can. I beg to hand in a copy of an official account, signed Thomas and David Sherrard, Secretaries to the Commissioners. I will beg to make a few remarks on this account. There appears here at the end of the account some observations, which I will read to the Committee; first, "a deficit of 334 *l.* 16 *s.* 11 *d.* appears in the collection of the year 1816, arising from the default of a collector who has been dismissed." I understand there were three insolvent grand jury collectors of the names of Phillips, Ellis, and O'Shaugnessy, in the course of the last five or six years to a considerable amount, and that one of those collectors was deficient about 1200 *l.* I have heard that he made up his accounts with the treasurer on account of the grand jury cess out of the funds in his hands belonging to the Wide-street Commissioners.

What reason have you to suppose so?—The printed paper here; stating that there had been a deficiency in one of the collectors, and that they had dismissed him, is one reason; and a very general report throughout the city is another; and under those two circumstances I have just mentioned I am inclined to think that the grand jury had failed in taking the necessary security from the collectors; and that the citizens have thereby lost so much of their money. I will read another part of this report: "A deficit of 8 *l.* 9 *s.* 6 *d.* appears in the collection of the year 1818, arising from the default of a collector subsequently dismissed. It is to be observed, the tax is collected by persons appointed by the term grand jury, and solely under their control." I have already remarked, in my evidence of yesterday, that the citizens of Dublin were unable to get any information from the Wide-street Commissioners as to the state of the accounts, notwithstanding applications having been made to that effect; and I will now take the liberty to read what is in this paper, which is an official return made by the Wide-street Commissioners: "Having ineffectually applied to the proper officers of the county of Dublin for a statement of the sum applotted by the grand jury within seven years to the purposes of their Board, they are unable to give any further information than the sums which have been received by them on this account, which are accordingly stated."

[*The Witness delivered in the account, which is as follows:*]

Wide Street Tax:—An Account of all Sums payable by the Inhabitants of Dublin, on account of Wide Street Tax; of the sums actually received an account thereof; and of the Arrears solvent and insolvent, from the 1st January 1814, to the 1st January 1821:—Also the basis of calculation of said Tax.

YEARS.		CHARGE:								
		Solvent Arrear from preceding Year.			Applotment, or Sums payable.			TOTAL.		
		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
City of Dublin.	1814 - -	1,029	8	– ½	7,037	10	2	8,066	18	2 ½
	1815 - -	1,017	12	– ½	7,067	17	7 ½	8,085	9	8
	1816 - -	1,025	15	3	7,250	13	3	8,276	8	6
	1817 - -	1,164	7	6	7,373	18	10	8,538	6	4
	1818 - -	1,290	11	4 ½	7,389	6	2	8,679	17	6 ½
	1819 - -	1,174	2	6 ½	7,402	14	10	8,576	17	4 ½
	1820 - -	698	11	– ½	7,548	9	4	8,247	–	4 ½
Parts of Co. within the Jurisdiction.	1814 - -	–			–			–		
	1815 - -	–			–			–		
	1816 - -	–			–			–		
	1817 - -	No return.			No return.			No return.		
	1818 - -	–			–			–		
	1819 - -	–			–			–		
	1820 - -	–			–			–		

(continued)

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(23 May.)

	YEARS.	DISCHARGE:											
		Sums Received.			Solvent Arrear.			Insolvent Arrear.			TOTAL.		
		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
City of Dublin	1814 - -	6,101	6	4	1,017	12	- ½	947	19	10	8,066	18	2 ½
	1815 - -	5,886	15	3	1,025	15	3	1,172	19	2	8,085	9	8
	1816 - -	5,374	19	2	1,164	7	6	1,402	4	11	7,941	11	7
	1817 - -	5,344	13	11 ½	1,290	11	4 ½	1,903	1	-	8,538	6	4
	1818 - -	5,285	17	6	1,174	2	6 ½	2,211	8	-	8,671	8	- ½
	1819 - -	5,222	14	9	698	11	- ½	2,655	11	7	8,576	17	4 ½
	1820 - -	4,944	7	6	442	4	4	2,860	8	6 ½	8,247	-	4 ½
Parts of Co. within the Jurisdiction.	1814 - -	1,110	8	8	–			–			–		
	1815 - -	799	14	7	–			–			–		
	1816 - -	809	6	11 ½	–			–			–		
	1817 - -	807	8	6	No return.			No return.			No return.		
	1818 - -	707	15	1	–			–			–		
	1819 - -	969	8	4	–			–			–		
	1820 - -	858	2	6	–			–			–		

By Order, *Thos. & Dav. Henry Sherrard,* Clerk.

Witness.—The basis of the calculation is therein stated as follows:—"The above tax is levied under an Act of the 47th of his late Majesty George the 3d, c. 74, s. 10, and the basis of the calculation is therein directed as follows; 'And for the better raising of the said instalments it shall and may be lawful to and for the said grand juries so assembled, or any twenty-four or more of them, and they are hereby empowered to present, rate, and assess, on all such houses and buildings, any sum or sums of money not exceeding 1*s.* in the pound in any one year, on the value of all such houses or other buildings, according to the valuation by which such houses or buildings respectively are now or hereafter may be valued or rated, for or towards the maintenance of the watch establishment of the said district.'" I have read through this for the purpose of showing to the Committee that the Wide-street Commissioners themselves cannot render an account, because they have failed in obtaining the information from the grand jury, they therefore are totally ignorant whether they receive the sum of money from the grand jury collector which they ought to receive, or not.

Can you inform the Committee what Acts of Parliament were in force at the time of the Union imposing a duty on coals for Wide-streets, and when that Act expired?—I have just looked at the Act of the 21st and 22d of Geo. 3, which is the first Act by which coals were made liable to a duty for the purposes of this Board; and it was to remain in force until the 25th of May 1788. Then again by another Act of the 23d and 24th of Geo. 3, it was continued to the 25th of May 1810. And by another Act of 49th Geo. 3. c. 72, it is continued in force until 1811; and then again by the 51st Geo. 3. c. 11, to remain in force until the 25th of March 1822. It may be fit for the Committee to consider whether these two latter Acts made since the Union were not a new burthen contrary to the Act of Union, inasmuch as when the Act passed in 1800 this duty was to expire at a specific day; therefore any new Act which imposed an additional charge and burthen upon the article must, as I view it, be in contradiction to that Act. I beg to mention also, that I have always heard that Government had guaranteed the payment of the interest of the debt of this Board, because the duty on coals was terminable at a specific period, known to both borrower and lender at the time of the contract; it therefore could be no security beyond that period; and had the Act of Union been adhered to the subsequent Acts renewing this duty should not have passed into a law; besides, there was no provision made, that I am acquainted with, for liquidating the debt by means of a sinking or any other surplus fund; and I have always understood no new work or valuation was ever undertaken without the consent of Government.

You have mentioned the duty of measuring the coals was occasionally done by deputy; have you any further explanation to give on that subject?—Yes, I have; I mentioned the names of Oulton and Allen, who were, as I was informed, master-measurers, and had that duty performed by deputy. Upon this point I wish to explain

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(23 May.)

more fully. My information went no farther than to state that those individuals, with one Ross, obtained a moiety of the fees from half-course men: this class consists of those measurers who are not in attendance upon any ship at full fees, and not often indulged with what is called full-course; they however obtain the largest ships, so as in some measure to make up for the division of the fees; and it has been mentioned to me that the full-course measurers were dissatisfied at this regulation, but were afraid to complain of those three individuals, as they had considerable authority and influence.

How do you mean that they have great influence; in what connexion?—Oulton, I understand, is brother-in-law to Alderman King; and I have been informed that this Ross is some sort of a servant about Alderman King's place.

Are there any anchorage or slippage-fees, or sums of money levied from oyster and herring-boats, wind-bound ships, sailing or steam-packets and by whom, and under what authority?—There are fees levied of 3*s.* 4*d.* upon every wind-bound ship, 2*s.* 2*d.* upon every herring-boat that happens to have two masts; 1*s.* 8*d.* upon every herring-boat with one mast; and on oyster boats 1*s.*; on each and every vessel, every time they come into the port, and packet-ships, whether steam or sailing, are also liable to 3*s.* 4*d.* There is also a further contribution obliged to be given of part of the cargo of boats laden with oysters, every one, whether large or small, that comes into Dublin, must give five hundred to the Lord Mayor, and one hundred to the water-bailiffs; and every herring-boat gives 2*s.* 6*d.* to the clerk of the market, for what is called settling the price. There has been an order of the House of Commons directed to the ballast-office, to make a return of those charges, and the ballast-office have sent in this answer; "The sums of money collected under those heads are not collected for the use or under the authority of the corporation for preserving and improving the port of Dublin." Part of what I have just mentioned, namely, what is collected from the wind-bound ships, and from herring and oyster-boats, is collected by the harbour-masters in the employment of the ballast-office; and it has been generally understood that it was for the ballast-office, for the anchorage and slippage.

Was there any bounty on coals borne coastwise to Dublin?—There was till lately; it commenced under an Act of the 31st Geo. 2, c. 14, and was enforced till the 1st of May 1766, and was again continued by the 47th Geo. 3, c. 45, to the 25th of March 1821, and has been discontinued since.

Is Dunleary of general utility to the trade of Dublin?—Not in any respect of as much advantage as the charge on the trade will be injurious; besides, the harbour being at a distance of about five miles from the city affords shelter to every description of shipping passing through the Irish Channel. Ships in the Dublin trade seldom go into the asylum-harbour, for so far it has been more resorted to in hard weather by ships passing to and from Liverpool. Without a ship-canal from Ringsend to the pier it cannot materially serve the trade of Dublin. The leading merchants there, together with the corporation for improving the port, were averse to the erection of the pier, until they were assured by the advocates of the measure that it would not be attended with any additional charge to the trade of Dublin, it being an asylum for the general trade of the Irish Channel; it is called the Asylum Harbour, and very properly so; its utility may be compared to what Holyhead is to the general trade of England, the one on the Irish side being built at the expense of the trade of Dublin, whilst that of Holyhead, and several other asylum-harbours in England, are at the expense of the nation. The revenues for this harbour, raised by Act of Parliament, 56 Geo. 3, c. 62, say on coal-ships, 2*d.* per ton; on all British traders 4*d.* per ton; also anchorage 8*s.* 1½*d.*; on invoicing 2*s.* 2*d.*; further for bond 2*s.* 2*d.* on outvoice; on each coal-ship 4*s.* 4*d.*, and on the entry, inwards or outwards, whether prime or post, 1*s.* 1*d.*, each; and upon a cocket for each shipment on board every vessel, 4*s.* 4*d.* The amount of those charges exceeds 8,000*l.* per annum. They are not only burthensome, but extremely vexatious to the trade.

Do you conceive that Howth Harbour is equally useless to the city of Dublin as Dunleary Harbour?—I think Dunleary Harbour is of more advantage.

At whose expense has Howth Harbour been constructed, amounting to 500,000*l.*—At the expense of the nation; but Howth is not calculated to afford shelter for large vessels, and is of very little use to the trade of Dublin.

Mr. John Peters, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. John Peters. (23 May.)

ARE you acquained with or do you know the manner in which coals are sold in Dublin?—I do; they are sold by measure; and I believe I may go on to answer that it is the general opinion that if they were sold by weight there would be greater justice done to the public. I have made inquiries on the quays from a certain class of persons, both of character and of property, coal-factors, and the answer they have given me is, that the public are robbed.

Would you take the opinion of the coal-factors, as the most unprejudiced and impartial, respecting the injustice of the present mode of selling coals in Dublin?—I have weighed that in my own mind, and I do not think they can be influenced by any private interest as to the sale of coals by measure more than by weight.

Do not you think that if the mode of selling coals was altered, namely, if it was changed to weight instead of measure, that a great part of the business of retailing coals would be transferred from the ships to the coal-factors yards?—I have not considered it. I have also asked persons who are entirely disinterested, who live on the quay, and they were of the same opinion.

Are there not yards established in Dublin under the superintendence of coal-factors for the sale of coals?—There are, for the purpose of stowing coals when they are cheap, in order to sell them out when they are dear.

Are those coal-yards resorted to by purchasers of coal more than the ships?—No; when there are ships at market they go to them; but when there are no ships they go to the coal-yards.

Then what inference do you draw from this, that the purchasers of coals, namely, the citizens of Dublin, who are supposed to know their own interests, prefer buying coals from the ships to buying them in the yards of the coal-factors?—The coal-factors must necessarily have a profit, and when coals are cheap, of course the purchasers will go to the first market.

But if frauds were supposed to exist in that mode of selling coals in the ships, would not the citizens naturally, in self defence, go to the place where no frauds are supposed to exist?—I have been present when great frauds were committed.

Will you have the goodness to answer the question?—It would be going to a second market to go to the coal-factors.

Then the Committee are to understand from your answer, that if a change was made, by which the sale of coals would be transferred to the yards of the coal-factors that a great increase of price would take place in that article?—I think it is natural to suppose that the coal-factors would not sell without a profit; but as to the frauds committed in measurement, I am quite certain of it, because I have been present at it. There are a certain number of measurers appointed, and those persons are of a certain description, completely under the control of the Guild of Merchants, and they are appointed for the purpose of doing justice; but I am satisfied they do not do justice. I was once present on board a ship, when I saw tubs delivered that were not near full; and I inquired for the master-porter; there was no such person on board. Seeing the very glaring injustice, I remonstrated with the person, and in fact he laughed at me; "Oh sir!" said he, "as they are not your coals you have nothing to do with it." The only remedy I had then was to stand by and see my own coals measured.

Did you make any complaint to the Coal Committee of that?—Indeed I did not; I never knew there was a Coal Committee; but I am aware there is a very considerable sum levied off the public, which amounts to above 10,000 *l.* a year. I believe the sixpence a ton amounts to that.

Are you aware of the mode of selling coals in London?—I am not; but I am quite satisfied, from inquiries I have made from disinterested persons, that the public would be much benefited by a change of the system in Dublin; and that four or five persons would answer the purpose of eighty or a hundred.

Do you think that a room-keeper would buy a bag of coals?—I can also say, that when poor persons come for a bag of coals, they always get the preference of me; they actually give them better measure; I was present and saw that. There is also a system of filling, which is a most fraudulent one, they call it arching.

Are you aware that the same objection with respect to measure would apply to corn as well as coals?—I am not competent to form an opinion.

Mr. Michael Cullen, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Michael Cullen.

(23 May.)

ARE any of the powers vested in the Commissioners of Paving and Lighting of the city of Dublin by the 47th of the late king, deemed inconvenient and oppressive to the householders?—Yes, I apprehend they are; I will state them to the Committee. The 39th section of the Act gives the Commissioners a power to value dead walls and vacant spaces of ground for the purposes of the Act, although the walls should inclose a yard or ground belonging to or adjoining a house or tenement, for every yard, running measure, of such dead wall or void space, at a rate not exceeding 3*s.* per yard, which is considered a great hardship upon many persons in the city who reside in corner houses, or other houses subject to this inconvenience, for which they also pay tax for the front next the street, and for the rear also, which may happen to be in stable-lanes. A house, for instance, of 25*s.* ministers money, would pay for the front 5*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* which is the utmost they have a right to charge, and they always do charge it. One half would be charged for the stable-lane, which would be 2*l.* 16*s.* 3*d.*; and if they happened to have a hundred feet at the side it would be 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, which would subject that house to more than 10*l.* a year for tax. The tax upon void spaces, or building-ground, is also considered very oppressive. There are many in the city of Dublin which are for building purposes, which continue unoccupied, so much so, that I have been told, and I believe the fact to be so, that the Paving Board have inclosed some ground that remained in their possession, as a pledge for the tax, and expenses of inclosing the ground. Owners of lodging-houses are also liable to a penalty of 5*l.* for not registering their places of abode when they do not reside in the house, although the tax may be distrained for or recovered by action or civil bill. I have also heard the tax complained of, as giving to the Commissioners an unreasonable and unnecessary power to compel the owners of dead walls and of void spaces of ground to scrape, cleanse, sweep, and wash the footways, gutters, or water channels once a day; and it is also considered an infringement on the property of landlords to give the tenant, who has no dust-hole or yard, a power of deducting any fine imposed upon him for throwing dirt into the street out of his rent, by which means the amount of rent reserved may be absorbed ten times over in cases where large old houses, without any rere to them, are let at small rents to several tenants, occupying single rooms or tenements in it. There is another circumstance which is considered sill more oppressive: By the 103d section of the Act, landlords are compelled to make dust-holes, or forfeit 20*l.* although the want of rere, or other circumstances, may make it impossible to do so.

Is the system adopted by the Paving Board complained of by the householders as calculated unnecessarily to increase the taxation?—Yes, I think it is; especially in consequence of the work not being performed by contract, which it is supposed would save considerably in the expenditure, and for the keep of horses, the use of carts, &c. and the purchase of those and other articles used in the scavengering department. The Board is also complained of as creating an unnecessary interference in matters which could be done by the parishes, and as being a waste and wanton expenditure of the funds raised by the tax, inasmuch as the expense of the Board itself appears to absorb about one third of the gross revenue, or what would pave and light nearly one third of the whole city.

Have you had any opportunity of ascertaining whether the householders of Dublin derive benefit from the attendance of coal-meters?—So far as the observations I have made extend, I apprehend the public derive no benefit whatever from them.

Have you ever bought coals at the ship?—Yes, I have often purchased coals on board; and very frequently the measurer has been absent, and when on board I have considered that his presence was rather injurious to my interest than otherwise.

For what reason?—If I had been left to watch it myself I should have had an opportunity of doing myself justice, whereas his presence served rather to sanction frauds than to be a check upon them.

Did you ever make a statement that their measure was not correct?—Yes, very often, and of the manner of filling them, and of the inattention of the measurers to the interest of the purchasers.

Did he refuse to give you justice?—He has so far refused that he did not satisfy me at all.

Did you make a complaint to the public authorities?—No, I never made any complaint of it to the public authorities.

Are you aware of the manner in which coal is sold in London?—I believe they

Mr. Michael Cullen.

(May 23.)

are sold by weight sometimes, but am not certain; I have made no inquiries about it, but I understand it is usual for the person who carries them about to take a measure with him, in order that the person purchasing may satisfy himself that he has the proper quantity.

How does that agree with your assertion, that you believe it is sold by weight, if he takes a measure?—I do not know whether it is sold by weight or not.

But you are aware that if you had any cause of complaint against the coal-meters, there is a court to which you can appeal for redress?—Yes; but I am not aware that I should receive much redress there.

Have you ever tried it?—No, I have not; they are appointed by the Lord Mayor and the corporation.

Is there any reason why the Lord Mayor and the members of the corporation of the city of Dublin should not be just as honest men as the members of a parish vestry?—No, I am not aware of any such reason.

Do you believe it would be more for the advantage of the public that coals should be sold by weight instead of by measure?—Yes; I do consider it would be a very great advantage to the house-holders of Dublin if coals were sold by weight instead of by measure.

Have you any particular reason?—A tub is supposed to contain a certain weight, but by the artful way of putting the coal into the measure, great frauds are constantly committed.

Do your objections to the mode of purchasing by measure apply to corn as well as coals?—I never purchased any corn; but I should suppose the same objections would not apply; corn would of course fit very closely into the measure, which the coal does not.

Can you suggest any other change that would be advantageous to the public?—I am not aware of any thing particular, unless it were to sell by weight, and not to subject the buyer to corporation charges; nothing could be a greater advantage to the public, either as private individuals or manufacturers, than having the coals cheaper, and particularly the manufacturer.

Have you known any instances of coals being seized after they had left the ship for bad measure. Yes; I have seen them seized in the streets very frequently; and I have seen them sometimes thrown about the streets for the poor people to gather up.

Did such coals come from the ship, or from a coal-factor's yard?—I do not know; it shows however that the authorities do not think they should rely much upon the coal-measurers; if the present plan is adhered to they ought certainly to carry a measure with them.

Do you think that it would be a better mode to change the system of selling coals from measure to weight, than to adopt a system by which the citizens could have their choice of buying either by measure or by weight?—I think if they were sold both by weight and by measure, that would be the best, because it has been supposed by some people that if they were sold by weight they might be wetted.

You are aware that the worst coals are the heaviest?—Yes, but the quality is easily known by inspection; and they cannot always give us the worst; when they have sold the worst they must sell the best.

Mr. Timothy Allen, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Timothy Allen.

WHAT is your situation?—I am clerk of the Guild of Merchants.

How long have you held that situation?—Since January 1796.

Did you, previous to your appointment, occasionally assist the former clerk of the Guild?—I did.

For any length of time?—Occasionally from the year 1784.

Does it appear from the records or the books of the Guild of Merchants that they were a corporation existing by prescription in the year 1438?—It does, by an ancient book which I have here.

Will you produce the book?

[*The witness produced a document, containing the rules and bye-laws of the Guild of Merchants, commencing in the year* 1438.]

Did not the Guild subsequently receive a charter from King Henry 6th by authority of Parliament, confirming them to be and to continue for ever a Fraternity or perpetual Guild of Merchants, with power to make bye-laws?—They did.

Can

Mr
Timothy Allen.

(23 May.)

Can you produce that charter?—I cannot; but here is Queen Elizabeth's Inspeximus of that charter, which of course recites the charter of Henry 6th.

[*The witness produced Queen Elizabeth's Inspeximus, which recites the words of the charter of King Henry* VI.]

That is in Latin. I have here a translation.

At what time, or by what record, does it appear that the Guild first exercised the right of appointing coal-meters, and fixing their wages?—In the year 1451. I will read the entry in the book; the date of this is 1451; it says, "The Monday next before the fourth Friday next after Midsummer Anno predicte, it is granted in the same assembly that the water-bailiffs make the coal-peck after twelve gallons, and that there be a porter sworn to mete the coals, and take for his labour of the buyers for every peck," I suppose it is, but this is not at all intelligible; some certain fee, which I cannot make out; it is either a halfpenny, or a farthing; I cannot say which.

Are there not other entries in the same book respecting the appointment and swearing in of coal-meters?—There are.

Several?—Several entries.

Have not the Guild subsequently received a charter from Queen Elizabeth, confirming the charter granted by King Henry 6, of the ancient privileges and uses of the Guild, and also giving them full power and authority of making and establishing from time to time, any laws or statutes which should seem meet, and to change or alter such laws?—They did; here is that charter of Elizabeth, and also a translation of it; the words are "We further give of our special grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, for us, our heirs and successors, as far as in us lieth unto the said masters, wardens, brethren, and sisters, and they and their successors, that they the masters, wardens, brethren, and sisters, and their successors, may have, hold, and invariably observe and keep, all and singular liberties, customs, privileges, franchises, and usages of old by them or their predecessors lawfully used or administered; and that the master, wardens, brethren, and sisters, for the time being, and their successors from time to time, for the future, may have and shall have full power, faculty and authority of erecting, constituting, ordaining, making, and establishing from time to time, any laws, ordinances, constitutions or statutes, which to them or their successors shall seem good, wholesome, honest, profitable, conducible or necessary, according to their wholesome discretions, for the good rule, government, support, or maintenance of the paternity or Guild aforesaid, as it shall seem by their experiences fit; and also the said laws, ordinances, constitutions, and statutes so ordained and made, from time to time to change, or of new to establish."

Does it not appear by the books and records of the Guild that they have ever since, from time to time exercised the right of appointing coal-meters, and fixing their wages?—It does.

Does not the Act of the 33d of Geo. 3d recognize the coal-measurers, and point out their particular duty?—It does; and here is the Act.

[*The Witness produced a copy of the same.*]

In what manner do the Guild of Merchants appoint the coal-meters?—By election. The guild are summoned and the election held. Every free brother has a vote; and whoever has the majority of votes is elected.

Is the meeting summoned by public advertisement?—There is a summons served upon every brother; we seldom advertise meetings now.

Are the inspector and book-keeper appointed in the same manner?—Certainly they are.

At what periods did the Guild increase the wages of the coal-meters?—They have increased them at different periods.

Will you state the periods?—When I came into office the meters wages had been raised to 3 d., when I was first assisting they were only 2 *d.*, and on the 13th of January 1794, were raised to 3 *d.*

Will you mention the reasons why they were raised?—They were raised in the first instance, as appears on the face of the book, to afford a sufficient remuneration for fifteen new coal-meters, which were then found necessary to be elected to discharge the coal-shipping, the former number not being sufficient for the quick and expeditious discharge of the vessels; then they elected fifteen new coal-meters; and in order to give them sufficient remuneration they were obliged to increase the wages one penny per ton.

Mr. *Timothy Allen.*

(23 May.)

Did all the coal-meters receive that additional fee?—Yes; if they had elected fifteen new men without making that increase it would have reduced the wages of the men then in office very much.

State the reason of the next increase?—In 1798 the wages were raised another penny, they were made four-pence; and it appears that the wages were inadequate at that period, and that they had increased the hours of attendance. The coal-meters in their petition for the increase last mentioned, stated, that the salaries of government officers had been all increased, and that the wages of tradesmen had been raised. The last increase, making the present wages, was on the 12th of July 1802; they were then raised to 6*d.* that was an increase of 2*d.*; the petition of the coal-meters requesting this increase showed that in consequence of the Union, and the residence of the gentry and nobility in this country, their emoluments were positively decreased one third; the object of the Guild also was to make those men more independent; the Guild wished very much to raise their character, and to make them independent of any idea of collusion and corruption, and they also laid on them the additional labour of keeping a tally of the exact amount of the coal discharged, which was a laborious duty; they very reluctantly gave this increase; some members of the Guild were against it, but the majority carried it in favour of an increase, and it passed.

Did the Guild think themselves entitled to make this increase in virtue of the charter which you have just recited?—They did, certainly.

Does the charter specify their power?—The charter gives them liberty to make new laws and statutes.

Was any remonstrance made at the time against their power to increase the wages?—No.

Has there been at all times, within your recollection, a Committee of the Guild, for the purpose of superintending the coal-meters establishment, and for hearing and redressing complaints relative thereto?—There always has.

How many members of the Guild constitute the Coal Committee, exclusive of the masters and wardens?—Twenty-seven; and the two masters and two wardens make thirty-one.

Do they not sit as often as is found necessary to hear and determine upon such complaints as may be made to them relative to the coal-meters establishment?—They do.

How often?—There is a fixed day, the first Friday in every month, but if there is occasion they sit oftener.

Have they at any time, within your recollection, refused to hear or redress any complaints made to them against any person connected with the coal-meters establishment?—I think not; so far as my judgment goes, they have always been ready to redress complaints.

If they refused to do so would it not be competent to any person who thought himself aggrieved to apply to the Guild on a quarter-day for redress?—Certainly it would.

Have you ever known an instance of any such application?—I have known some gentlemen come to the Guild, but they made no regular written application; I remarked a Mr. Tomlinson, a coal-factor, coming there and speaking, but he presented no memorial. There was a kind of conversation.

Where do the Committee sit?—In their new hall; they used to sit in the Shakespear gallery.

Have you known any officers dismissed for misconduct?—Several.

On what ground?—Whenever a complaint for misconduct appeared to the Committee to require that severity, they have reported to the Guild such an opinion, who have dismissed them.

Have many complaints been made?—I cannot say many; the book is here, which will show the exact number; it is surprising there have been so few, when there are so large a number as eighty meters.

If any thing special occurs does not the Coal Committee refer it to the Guild at large for their determination at quarter-day?—They do report and state their opinion, and leave it to the Guild to decide.

When it is found necessary, does not the Coal Committee examine parties on oath?—They do, whenever there is a magistrate present, which is generally the case; they do not, without there is a magistrate present.

Has not the Coal Committee, in every instance of complaint before them, been governed by a desire of doing justice to the public?—I certainly think so, except that

Mr. Timothy Allen

(23 May.)

that they have been on some occasions, perhaps, a little too merciful; when it was necessary to be severe they have been severe; but they have sometimes tempered their justice with mercy.

In such complaints as have been brought before the Coal Committee respecting coal-meters, have not a great number of such complaints been brought forward by the inspector and book-keeper of the establishment?—A great number; the majority have been brought forward by the inspector and book-keeper.

Are you at all acquainted with the power which the Corporation of London have over the sale of coals in London?—Except from what I have heard since I came here, I am not; I have got some information from the officers.

Do you know whether the Corporation of London has the right of appointing the coal-meters in their district, and do not they derive considerable emolument from the metage of coals?—Very considerable; and I can state the probable amount from what I have heard; the land-coal-meters in London are in number forty-five; it appears to me that their wages are 6*d.* per chaldron for the measurement; those fees are paid into the corporation fund, and those men only get about 1 *l.* 8 *s.* a-week for their labour, or about 70 *l.* per annum; from that the Corporation of London must derive a very large revenue, perhaps 4 or 5,000*l.* a-year. The wages of the sea-coal-meters, of which I understand there are 120, are 4*d.* per chaldron for measurement; and I have been informed that the Corporation take 3 *d.* of that 4*d.*, and they pay them 1 *d.* per chaldron, but the sea-coal-meters from this and their other emoluments, have about 250*l.* per annum each, and thus I should suppose, the Corporation put into their funds very large sums, perhaps from 10 to 15,000*l.* a-year.

Do the Guild of Merchants in Dublin derive any emolument from or receive any part of the metage on coals?—Nothing; they give it all to the men.

Do the Guild of Merchants receive a fee on the election of a measurer?—The Guild of Merchants do receive a fee, which I can state; there is an old fee of ten Guineas, which was always paid into the funds of the Guild, on the election of a coal-meter, and for some time back the masters fees have been also paid into the Guild.

What has the master?—The senior master had on the election of a coal-meter twelve guineas, the junior master had 1 *l.* 14*s.* 1½. *d.* that goes into the funds of the Guild, so that the Guild receive now upon the election of each coal-meter, 26*l.* 14*s.* 7½*d.*: the clerk has a guinea and a half on the election of each coal-meter; the inspector one guinea; the book-keeper one guinea; the beadle half a guinea; making the whole 31*l.* 5*s.* 7*d.* that every coal-meter pays on his election.

Is any thing of that kind paid by the meters here?—I cannot say, I have not inquired into that.

Is any security given by any of the meters, or is a character required, in Dublin?—Yes; and previous to elections there is a paper, stating each candidate's qualifications; that he is a freeman of the City of Dublin; that he has no employment under the revenue; that he is a healthy, honest, sober, and diligent man, capable of executing the duties of his employment. This certificate must be signed by five or six respectable citizens, with their residence annexed, and it is handed into the hall previous to the commencement of the election.

Do not the Coal Committee act gratuitously?—Certainly; they always have done so.

Have not some of the coal-factors or dealers in Dublin, at different times, resisted the right of the Guild with respect to the coal-meters establishment?—They have.

Have not they been defeated at law in their attempts?—They have.

Will you state the particulars of those transactions?—In July 1819, Torkington and Flower, coal-meters, lodged informations against a coal-factor, of the name of Thomas Francis Russell, and two men of the name of Betts and Fitzgerald, his assistants or porters. There were two assaults committed; that is, an assault upon each of those two, Torkington and Flower, under, I think, very aggravated circumstances. The men were doing their duty in a gabbard of this Russell's, at the Dodder Bank. This prosecution was in the Sessions Court of Dublin. The bills were found, and all things prepared for trial; and after employing counsel, and in every way preparing, the then Recorder made an objection, that being a free merchant himself he would not try it. He refused to do so through delicacy, and that case was obliged to fall to the ground in consequence of the Recorder making that objection.

Mr.
Timothy Allen.
(25 May.)

It was not decided then at all?—No; I will beg to mention another case. In October 1819, Fitzpatrick, coal-meter, proceeded in the Court of Conscience against one Cochran; he was captain of a ship, I believe. There were several other captains incited by coal-factors, at that time resisting the payment of the coal-meters wages, and they were depending in the Court of Conscience before the late Alderman Warner; he was loth to decide on the question, on account of the number of legal objections, or objections in point of law, that were made; and in order to decide the legal point, and that he might give his judgment correctly, he had a special hearing of one of those cases which I have mentioned, Fitzpatrick *v.* Cochran. On that occasion he had Mr. Driscol, King's counsel, for his assessor; the parties attended before them, and there were three lawyers of eminence on each side; this case held full two days in discussion and evidence before the President, and the result was that, by the advice of Mr. Driscol, his assessor, he gave judgment for the plaintiff, that is for the coal-meter; and that case being decided he decided the others which were then pending in the same way; one case governed them all. The particulars of the judgment are here; Mr. Driscol gave a very elaborate judgment and opinion upon that occasion, which guided the President.

Were the parties satisfied with that proceeding, or were there any ulterior proceedings taken?—It appears to me that Mr. Driscol's judgment was so decided, and founded on such good grounds, that the parties at that time submitted.

Have there been any other attempts made to resist the payments of the coal-meters?—There was an action much about that time. One Captain Harris had been arrested under the warrant of Alderman Bloxham, President of the Court of Conscience, who gave a decision in favour of the coal-meter for his wages; and a warrant being issued, this Captain Harris was arrested, and he brought an action for false imprisonment, as I believe; I am not quite certain; but I understand that it was an action for false imprisonment, and it came on in one of the law-courts, I cannot say which, for I have it not here, but I saw the judgment; it went by default; Captain Harris failed to proceed, and of course there was a judgment by default in favour of Alderman Bloxham against Harris.

Then the Committee are to understand that the question as to the right and title has never been decided in a court of law, except in the Court of Conscience?—No; I will mention another instance; in Easter term 1820, the same Francis Thomas Russel who had been indicted, thought proper to make an application to the Court of King's Bench, in the case of McDermot Creagh and Twyford, coal-meters; this was for a prohibition to issue to the president of the Court of Conscience, to prevent him from awarding the wages of the coal-meters; the argument and evidence occupied several days on both sides; there were three eminent lawyers on each side; and the result was that the Court would not grant a prohibition to prevent the President: so far the right of the Guild was established. Afterwards, in August 1820, there was another prosecution, Ross and Landers, coal-meters, against Bartholomew St. Leger, his nephew, and his porter. This was a case of assault in the execution of their duty; it was brought on in the Sessions Court, and the Recorder, after hearing the evidence, charged the jury that they should convict, but to our great astonishment they thought fit to bring in a verdict of acquittal.

Are you of opinion that such attempts were for the benefit of themselves or the public?—It appeared to me that their motives were all through those several cases selfish; that they were directed to their own benefit, and that the public benefit was not a consideration with them.

Do you not believe that they had an anxious desire to sell coals to the public without the intervention or superintendence of coal-meters; and that those complaints against the coal-meters establishment originated entirely with the dealers?—I conceive so.

Have you ever heard that some of the coal-dealers have had several meetings to forward their views in this respect?—I have heard so, and have no doubt of it.

Do you not believe that the respectable coal-factors in Dublin are at all times desirous of the superintendence of the coal-meters on board the ships?—The respectable coal-factors are not, I believe, very numerous; but I have heard some of them declare that they could not carry on the trade without the superintendence of the coal-meters.

Is it not your opinion that the respectable housekeepers of Dublin are equally desirous of the superintendence of the coal-meters?—Such persons as I have conversed with, and as an individual housekeeper myself, I am certainly very anxious that the coal-meters should be present.

Have

Mr. Timothy Allen.

(23 May.)

Have not some of the coal-meters at different times been assaulted on board ship by coal-dealers who are hostile to their establishment?—They have, as I before mentioned.

Has not such opposition to the coal-meters arisen from their desire to have impartial justice done between the buyer and the seller?—I think so; the coal-meters appear to me to be always anxious to do their duty; and if they were supine I should think they would meet with no resistance, because it is in endeavouring to do their duty they meet with opposition.

Does not the intervention of the coal-meters frequently prevent disputes between the buyer and seller?—Certainly; there is some third person necessary between buyer and seller, and they are the proper officers, and I think do prevent disputes.

Why do you think there is a third person necessary between buyer and seller?—I think it is mostly the object of buyers to get over-measure, and it is, perhaps, the object of the seller to give under-measure, and therefore some check, as between the two, is necessary.

Would you apply that to purchases of every kind?—Perhaps it is so in several cases.

Is it not more necessary in a bulky article like coal, which being once removed from the place of sale is not afterwards submitted to the inspection of the buyer?—I do conceive so; I think coal is so bulky that it would be almost impossible for the buyer to ascertain by his own measurement whether he had got his right quantity.

Do not you think the intervention of a third person is more necessary in that article than in the article of butter, for instance?—Certainly.

Has not the superintendence of the coal-meters, as a check for the Revenue and Wide-street duty on Coals, caused a considerable increase of revenue to those two departments?—It has. Here is a return or a certificate from the Board of Wide Streets, which will show it very plainly.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

Wide Streets, Dublin:—A Return of the Duty on Coals paid into the Treasury for Account of the Commissioners of Wide Streets, from the 5th January 1811 to the 5th January 1822; distinguishing the amount paid in each year.

1. 1811.	2. 1812.	3. 1813.	4. 1814.	5. 1815.	6. 1816.
£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
10,928 8 9	11,477 – –	7,682 – –	12,406 6 6	14,250 – –	12,383 2 5

7. 1817.	8. 1818.	9. 1819.	10. 1820.	11. 1821.	—
£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
13,367 8 8	11,490 – –	13,005 9 9	12,595 7 3	12,820 – –	—

* Fell off from 1812—3,795 *l.* in one year, when coal-meters tallies not returned.

Blessington Street, 11th April 1823. *Thos.* and *D. H. Sherrard,* Sec.

		£.	s.	d.	
1814	- Duty -	12,406	6	6	above
1813	- ditto -	7,682	–	–	ditto
Increase from 1813 to 1814, by reason of coal-meters tallies being returned -		4,724	6	6	

	£.	s.	d.	
1821 -	12,820	–	–	above
1813 -	7,682	–	–	ditto
Increase -	5,138	–	–	in 1821 compared with 1813.

The Revenue Duty is 1 *s.* 9 *d.* per ton, and the Wide street 1 *s.*; consequently the Revenue Duty increased in the same proportion.

Has

Mr.
Thomas Allen.

(23 May.)

Has not this increased activity rendered the coal-meters unpopular among those concerned in the importation of coal?—I think it has; the more the coal-meters exert themselves the more they have excited the ill will of persons who are not inclined to deal fairly.

Who appoints the water-bailiffs?—The water-bailiffs are appointed by the Lord Mayor, sheriffs and common council, that is the corporation at large.

Do the water-bailiffs supply the captains of the ships with the measuring-tubs, or do the officers of the Guild of Merchants supply the tubs?—The water-bailiffs only, as long as I have known. By the book which I have produced it appears that they were the persons to make the coal-measures nearly four hundred years ago.

Then different parties appoint the measurer and the measures?—Certainly; the corporation of Dublin appoint the water-bailiffs, and the Guild of Merchants appoint the measurers.

Are you a coal-measurer?—No, I am not; I never was.

Have you any deputy acting for you in that capacity?—No.

Do you receive any fees as a coal-meter?—No; but I will mention candidly that I receive fees out of the metage.

What are they?—There are eighty coal-meters, and when those eighty coal-meters have been put on ships, there is an eighty-first ship put on duty for me, of which I take one half; this amounts to about 33*l.* a-year; it was given to me by the Guild as secretary to the Coal Committee, as a remuneration for my long services, and for additional trouble which I had and still have in keeping a book so completely indexed that in a moment you can find how many complaints have been made against a coal-meter, and see what his character is. It was also an object of the Guild in giving it to me, to make me some compensation for the loss of fees I sustained as clerk of the Guild. When the Guild made an order several years ago that those coal-meters should not in future be allowed to sell or traffic their places, it reduced my emoluments very considerably; the Guild did that in order to make the men more respectable, and to prevent the improper traffic that was then going on. I lost a good deal of fees by that order; and I have also acted on all occasions ever since as the adviser of the coal-meters, when a point of law may arise, informing them how they should act, and, if necessary, draw informations for them, and try to get them redressed; those were some of the reasons for which I got that allowance, but which is no charge on the public.

Is Mr. Ross in partnership with you?—No; there is no particular coal-meter affected by the remuneration given to me.

Is there a person of your name a coal-meter?—No, there never was.

Is Mr. Oulton similarly situated; has he any advantage from the metage?—None, excepting the booking, and other fees that he gets from the coal-meters; he has no half-course as I have; he never was a meter.

Have you about you any particulars of the complaints made to the Coal Committee?—I have.

Of what nature were they?—Some for inattention to duty; whenever it appears that a complaint is well founded, the man is fined; he may be fined a course, and that may amount to two guineas loss to him.

Can you tell the Committee what reason you have for thinking that the respectable householders of Dublin are anxious that the meters should continue.

I think persons cannot depend on the measure they get from the Quay, unless a coal-meter be present, or unless they go, or send their servants there to watch it home.

Do you think the masters of ships are not to be depended on?—We know that self-interest is a strong motive, and no man can resist his own interest. I have known captains often give bad measure, throwing in large coals, so as to arch them, as it is called, and leaves space between them, and leave hollows at top; as soon as the coal-meter sees the arching, or the top not filled, he may strike it down, and enforce fair measure. From all this I conceive that every householder ought to feel the value of those men, and to be happy to have their superintendence.

The opposition to those men you think generally does not arise from the masters of ships?—From the factors chiefly; the masters of ships, I believe, are not inclined to resist.

Have you not remarked any case coming before the Committee, in which masters of ships appear to have assaulted or in any way obstructed those meters?—One of the cases I mentioned was the captain of a ship; but then it appeared to be at the instigation of some factors.

What

Mr. Timothy Allen.

(23 May.)

What do you think was the cause of his opposition?—The factors wish to buy and sell with what measures they please; and they, perhaps, would not lessen the price of their coals one penny if the coal-meters were discontinued.

Do not you think if the sale of coals was transferred from the ships to the coal-factors yards, that a great monopoly would arise in that article?—I have no doubt that there would, because the captains of ships coming in wish to sell their cargoes quickly, and bring a fresh cargo; whereas, if the coals were all in factors yards, the factors might keep up the price, and thereby create a monopoly.

Lunæ, 26° *die Maii*, 1823.

SIR ROBERT SHAW, BARONET,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Richard Oulton, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

WHAT situation do you hold in Dublin?—I hold the situation of assistant inspector and book-keeper to the Coal Establishment under the Guild of Merchants.

How long have you held that situation?—About sixteen years.

What is the nature of your situation?—The nature of my situation is to keep a regular roster, or tally of the men, to enter them down regularly as they are cleared on the ships; and when the captains come to the office I enter their names and their ship.

What is the mode of your appointment?—I am appointed under the Guild of Merchants.

In what manner?—By election. They advertise that there is a vacancy, and the merchants meet to ballot; and it was by a majority of ballots in the Guild of Merchants that I was elected.

The duties of your situation at first were merely to keep the tallies?—Yes, to keep tallies, and entries of the ships, and to place the coal-meters on their respective duties.

Has not some additional duty been added on the part of the Custom House?—Yes; the captains go to the Custom House and make a ship-entry, and bring the docket of that entry to my office. I am obliged to enter the captain's ship and his name in my book, and put my name across the entry, which makes it his order for discharging; without my name across it he would be prevented from discharging by the Custom House officers.

Do you derive any additional emolument for the performance of that duty?—None whatever. When the vessel is clear, the captain brings me the same landing-order again, and I am obliged to enter the quantity of coal discharged on the back of the order; from that indorsement he pays the entire duty as it is there—[*here witness produced a written document, showing the manner in which it was done*]—and without that discharge he cannot get cleared out. Formerly it used to be done by a surveyor and landwaiters on the quays; the Commissioners of Customs dissolved that establishment, and then transferred the business to the Jerquer's Office. The first thing I did at that period, when I came to my office each morning, was to make a return to the Jerquer's Office of the number of ships that coal-meters had been demanded for the day before, and to make a return of what ships were cleared. The Commissioners have abolished this office entirely, and threw all the responsibility upon me, and for which, as I have already mentioned, I receive no remuneration from the revenue, though a great deal of expense has been saved by adopting these regulations.

It appears by this return that the ship Good Intent is stated to have contained 141 tons of coals; and in your handwriting it appears that it contained 181; what is the reason of that difference?—That is the amount as entered in the landing-order; they were formerly in the habit of paying duty for no more; and when the Commissioners of Wide Streets and the Commissioners of Customs called upon our Establishment to make the returns, they found that the captains did not pay within one third of what they ought, and it is in consequence of my return to the Custom House that that increase of duty is paid.

The Committee are to infer from your answer, that the duty which you do for the Custom House tends very materially to increase the duties which are paid?—The increase is about 14,000*l.* a-year.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

Is there any other officer on the coal-meters establishment in the election of the Guild?—There is Mr. William Howard, who is the inspector.

What duty is attached to his situation?—His duty is to see that the men are attending carefully to the admeasurement of the coals, and if any of them are absent, to report them to me, and to put other meters on duty in their places, and I report them to the Coal Committee, and if there is any dispute on the quays he generally settles it.

Is he always present?—He is generally, from ship to ship: he is not well now nor has not been so for some time.

How many coal-meters are there?—Eighty.

How are they appointed?—By election in the Guild of Merchants, in the same way that I was myself.

Were there eighty coal-meters on the establishment previous to your election?—There were.

What are their duties?—Their duty is to attend to the admeasurement of the coals on the ships, and to keep a strict tally of the same, which they return to me. If I doubted any captain's return, I should swear the meter before a magistrate; and frequently it has occurred, when the captains went to the Custom House to pay the duty, that they would make up a return not agreeing with the coal-meters. I was then called upon by the officers of the Custom House to bring the coal-meter forward, which I did, and the surveyor generally drew up an affidavit such as he thought necessary, and I made that man go before one of the police magistrates, and make an affidavit of the actual quantity. It frequently occurred, before this system was followed, that the captains went forward and made an affidavit of a quantity short of the actual one; for these duties nothing is paid to any person in our Establishment by either the Revenue or Wide Streets Commissioners.

When appointed to a ship, what number of hours in each day are they on duty?—In the summer, eight months of the year, from six o'clock in the morning till eight at night, and in the four winter months of November, December, January and February, they are from seven o'clock in the morning till five in the evening; some of the captains, before this regulation took place, were in the habit of discharging coals in the night, or very early in the morning, to deceive the master-porter, and I applied to the Coal Committee, and they, from my application, applied to the Commissioners of Customs to confine the captains to particular hours of discharging, and the Commissioners ordered their quay-officers to attend, to prevent the captains from discharging except during those hours; and if it should appear that the master-porter should be absent, or taken ill, Mr. Howard reports it to me, and I put another master-porter immediately on duty.

A master-porter is the same as a coal-measurer?—It is the same.

What wages per ton do they receive for the performance of their duty?—Sixpence per ton; they have no other allowance, save a bag of coal, worth about sixteen pence. The London Coal Act allows, besides the metage, one guinea for each ship, in lieu of coals and other gratuities, and 3 *s.* per day while on board ship, in lieu of provisions and drink; our coal meters have no allowance of this kind whatever.

By whom is it paid?—By the captain.

Were the wages of 6 *d.* a ton to coal-meters established previous to your appointment?—They were.

Have not the coal-meters a gratuity of half a barrel of coals from the ship on the cargo being discharged?—They have, but it is not looked upon by the Guild of Merchants that the captain is obliged to give it. I have before stated, that the London coal-meter is allowed a guinea by Act of Parliament in lieu of coals.

What is the average value of a half barrel?—About sixteen pence.

Did that custom exist previous to your appointment?—For sixty years, at least.

Are not the deputy sea-coal-meters in London entitled by an Act of Parliament to one guinea from each ship upon its delivery, in room of allowances on coals?—They are, as appears by the schedule to the Act of Parliament of the 47th Geo. 3, s. 2, c. 68, p. 1247.

Are you remunerated for your services by fees, or by salary?—By fees.

What are those fees?—I have one shilling per ship for signing the landing-order, or certificate, when the captain brings it to me; I have 2 *s.* 2 *d.* from the coal-meter, when the ship has cleared out her cargo, which is paid out of the metage, making in all 3 *s.* 3 *d.*, and 4 *d.* for the expense of a messenger.

Upon each ship is that?—Upon each ship.

Is that all the amount of your salary?—That is the amount, except some trifling

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

thing on an election of a meter, and an ancient fee of 5 *s.* 5 *d.* per annum from each meter, payable under the order of the Guild, as also a sum of 2 *s.* 2 *d.* per annum, payable in like manner; the superannuated coal-meters pay me 6 *d.* in the pound agency for collecting their money.

Is the inspector remunerated for his services in the same manner?—He is.

What are the fees payable to him?—He gets from the captain half-a-crown on each certificate or landing-order; he gets the same from the coal-meters as I do, that is 2 *s.* 2 *d.* out of the metage; but he has nothing for a messenger.

Were those fees to both officers established previous to your appointment?—They were.

What is the whole amount of your salary for that duty?—The whole amount of the fees and wages paid to the inspector, book-keeper and meters I made a return of to Parliament; the whole amount of fees payable to me out of ships discharging coals in the port of Dublin, on an average, is about 300 *l.* a-year, two thirds of which is paid to me out of the metage, and the remainder of that sum, which does not exceed 100 *l.* per annum, is made up of the fee of 1 *s.* 1 *d.* payable by each ship on obtaining the landing-order, as I have before stated. Here is a copy of the return I made to Parliament.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

An Account of all Port Duties, Charges or Fees paid to the Inspector, Book-keeper or the Coal Meters appointed by the Guild of Merchants, Dublin, on all Ships discharging Coals in the Port of Dublin, during three years, ending January 1822, under the name of Fees or Gratuities to Coal Meters, or Inspector or Book-keepers Fees, or other Fees of whatever description, and by whatever other name designated, with the Name and Amount of Salary of Officer or Officers receiving or collecting the same; distinguishing the Particulars of all Dues, Charges or Fees, to what purpose applied, and under what Law or Authority levied.

Amount of Coals discharged out of ships for the year 1819, 250,136 tons, 7 ½ barrels.

	£.	s.	d.
Coal-meters wages on the above quantity of coals, at 6 *d.* per ton, being their entire charge and receipt	6,253	8	6
William Howard, inspector, his fees, 1,793 ships at 2 *s.* 8 *d.* ½ per	242	16	– ½
Richard Oulton, book-keeper, fees on 1,836 ships and Custom House bottoms at 1 *s.* 1 *d.* per	99	9	–
	£. 6,595	13	6 ½

The above wages and fees are received by authority of the Guild of Merchants, who have the appointment of the coal-meters and officers, and there is not any other fee or wages received or chargeable on coal-ships by this establishment.

Amount of coals discharged out of ships for the year 1820, 257,328 tons, 5 barrels.

	£.	s.	d.
Coal-meters wages on the above quantity of coals, at 6 *d.* per ton, being their entire charge and receipt	6,433	4	3
William Howard, inspector, his fees on 1,731 ships, at 2 *s.* 8 *d* ½ per	234	8	1 ½
Richard Oulton, book-keeper, his fees on 1,776 ships and Custom House bottoms at 1 *s.* 1 *d.* per	96	4	–
	£. 6,763	16	4 ½

Amount of coals discharged out of ships for the year 1821, 236,494 tons, 6 barrels.

	£.	s.	d.
Coal-meters wages on the above quantity of coals, at 6 *d.* per ton, being their entire charge and receipt	5,912	7	4 ½
William Howard, inspector, his fees on 1,779 ships, at 2 *s.* 8 *d.* ½ per	240	8	1 ½
Richard Oulton, book-keeper, his fees on 1,820 ships and Custom House bottoms, at 1 *s.* 1 *d.* per	98	11	8
	£. 6,251	7	2

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Coal-meters wages on the admeasurement of 250,136 tons, 7½ barrels of coals discharged from ships in the year 1819, in the port of Dublin -	6,253	8	6			
Coal-meters wages, on 36 Yards, for the admeasurement of 2,240 tons 4 barrels of coals for the year 1819 - - - - - - -	56	–	3			
				6,309	8	9
Out of which coal-meters pay the following sums; viz.						
Inspector on 1,874 bookings, at 2 *s.* 2 *d.* per -	203	–	4			
Book-keeper for the same - - -	203	–	4			
Ditto for the messenger, about - - - -	36	–	–			
				442	–	8
				5,867	8	1
There are eighty coal-meters; the average of the above sum to each meter - - - - - -				73	6	10½
Coal-meters wages on the admeasurement of 257,328 tons 5 barrels of coals, discharged from ships in the year 1820 - - - -	6,433	4	3			
Coal-meters wages on six Yards, for the admeasurement of 541 tons of coals for the year 1820 -	13	10	6			
				6,446	14	9
Out of which, coal-meters pay the following sums; *viz.*						
Inspector on 1,826 bookings, at 2 *s.* 2 *d.* per -	197	16	4			
Book-keeper for the same - - - -	197	16	4			
Ditto for messenger, about - - - -	36	–	–			
				431	12	8
				6,015	2	1
The average of this sum to each coal-meter - -				75	3	9½
Coal-meters wages, on the admeasurement of 236,494 tons 6 barrels of coals, discharged from ships in the year 1821 -				5,912	7	4½
Out of which coal-meters pay the following sums; *viz.*						
Inspector on 1776 bookings, at 2 *s.* 2 *d.* per -	192	8	–			
Book-keeper for the same - - - - -	192	8	–			
Ditto for messenger - - - - - -	36	–	–			
				420	16	–
£.				5,491	11	4½
The average of this sum to each meter - -				68	12	10½

The coal-meter usually gets a bag of coals as a gratuity from the captain of the ship, on the cargo being discharged.

Observations.—The officers of this establishment have no salary; they are remunerated for their constant services and attendance by the fees hereinbefore stated, out of which they have to provide an office, coals and candles, stationery, &c.

By order of His Majesty's Commissioners of Customs returns from the office of this establishment of the quantity of coals discharged from each ship on its being cleared out have been made to the Customs for nearly ten years, which has saved to His Majesty's revenue the necessity and expense of providing so many ship officers; and it will be seen by reference to the books of entry at the Custom House, that since the regulation commenced by which the coal-meters became a check for the revenue as to the number of tons of coal discharged from each ship, and by the certificates from the proper officers of His Majesty's Customs and of the Board of Wide-streets in Dublin, that the revenue and the Wide-streets duty on coals have been increased above 12,000*l.* per annum, and for the performance of which duty no remuneration whatever is made to this office, either by the revenue, or the Commissioners of Wide-streets.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May)

The coal-meters are obliged to stand on the deck, and to attend the admeasurement of coals out of ships for eight months in the year, from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock at night, and for the four winter months from seven o'clock in the morning until five o'clock in the evening, except during the hours appointed for breakfast and dinner.

The coals are measured out to the public as in London, in the presence of a sworn meter, in half-barrel tubs, (sixteen of which make a ton) provided by the water-bailiffs, who are officers appointed by the Corporation of Dublin. The size of the tub or half-barrel is regulated by an Act of Parliament passed in the first year of the reign of His Majesty King George the 2d, (1727) and each tub is sealed by the clerk of the market, as directed by the statute.

The inspectors duty is to visit each ship, to see that the meters do their duty correctly, and if any complaint, be made to report it to the Coal Committee appointed by the Guild of Merchants, who sit for the purpose of hearing and redressing any such complaints.

Quay-officers have been appointed by the Commissioners of Customs over the coal-ships, to prevent the discharge of coals during the breakfast and dinner-hours of the coal-meters.

Richard Oulton,
Book-keeper to the Coal-meters Establishment, appointed by the Guild of Merchants, Dublin.

Coal-meters Office, Dublin, April 1823.

An Account of the respective Periods at which the Dues, Charges or Fees of the Coal Meters in Dublin were first levied, and at what periods respectively they have been increased, until they reach the specific Sums they now stand.

The time when those wages were first levied is too remote to be now ascertained, but it may have been long prior to the year 1451. The first regulation that can be found for ascertaining the same is by authority of an entry in an ancient journal of the Guild Merchants, dated Midsummer, 30th Henry 6, 1451, which fixed the wages for measuring every twelve gallons of coals at the price of (not now easily intelligible, but supposed to be) one farthing, which would amount to much more than the present wages.

This bye-law of the Guild was confirmed by a charter from King Henry the 6th, also by a charter from Queen Elizabeth, both by authority of Parliament, which gave the Guild full power to make such new bye-laws as to them should seem expedient.

The coal-meters wages fixed at 2*d.* per ton by authority of the Guild, by a bye-law, dated 14th January 1677.

The wages were raised to three pence per ton by authority of the Guild on the 13th January 1794, and this was necessarily done, in order to afford remuneration to an increased number of fifteen new coal-meters, then found indispensable to be appointed to attend the coal-shipping, in order to do justice to the public, and to prevent delays in the delivery of coals to purchasers.

The meters wages were increased to fourpence per ton by authority of the Guild, on the 16th of April, 1798, which the Guild was induced to allow on account of the inadequacy of the wages of 3*d.* per ton to support them and their families, and in consequence of the increased hours of their attendance.

The last increase to sixpence per ton, being the present rate, (and which is far less than the rate allowed in 1451,) was allowed by authority of the said Guild of Merchants on the 12th of July 1802, being upwards of twenty years ago, upon consideration of the benefit that would arise to their fellow citizens from giving the coal-meters such remuneration as would prevent any collusion between them and the captains and masters of coal-ships, by making them more independent of those captains and masters, and also in consideration of the additional labour then put on the coal-meters, in keeping an exact tally in writing of the discharge of every cargo.

The consequence of this increase has been, that a more respectable class of citizens now fill the situation of coal-meters; strict justice is done to the public by their constant attention to the admeasurement of coals, and His Majesty's revenue, and the Wide Street duties thereon, have been increased at least 12,000*l.* per annum.

Timothy and John Allen,
Clerks of the Guild of Merchants, Dublin.

Witness.—I can state particularly the amount of my income and Mr. Howard's. Mr. Howard's for the year 1819, was 445*l.* 16*s.* 5½*d.*, and mine was 302*l.* 9*s.* 4*d.*

Mr.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

Mr. Howard's emolument for the year 1820 is 532*l.* 4*s.* 5½*d.*; my emolument was 294*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.* for the year 1821. Mr. Howard's situation was worth 432*l.* 16*s.* 1½*d.*; and mine 290*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.*: there are some small sums, the particulars of which I before mentioned, that increase it a little, and which are payable by the coal-meters, under the order of the Guild, as I have already stated, out of which we have to pay for the rent of an office, and for coals, candles, stationery, &c.

By what authorities are those fees exacted from the different ships?—The fee of 1*s.* 1*d.* from the captains on signing the ship's landing-order, has been time immemorial; the half crown that has been paid to Mr. Howard originated under the following circumstances: there were quay-officers appointed to the coal ships, and those quay-officers put the captains to the expense of probably two guineas, or more, and they were of no manner of use; the captains applied to Mr. Howard, who was then and still is the inspector over the coals, to get them removed, and he applied to Government. Mr. Abbot, who is now, I believe, Lord Colchester, was secretary of state at the time; he applied to him, and Mr. Abbot referred him to the Commissioners of Customs, and they made their report to him; and he was so perfectly satisfied with it, that he ordered the quay-officers to be done away with from the coal-ships, and the Guild in consequence ordered the inspector, Mr. Howard, to be paid half a crown per ship; and that has existed nearly twenty-four years.

Do not you and the inspector out of your fees pay for the rent of an office; and provide coals, candles, and stationery?—We do.

By what measure are coals sold out of the ship to the public?—In half-barrel tubs; sixteen of them go to a ton.

That is by Act of Parliament?—Yes.

Just mention the Act?—The 1st of Geo. 2. c. 22. s. 2.

Who provides the captains of the coal-ships with the use of those tubs?—The water-bailiffs.

Are the water-bailiffs elected by the Guild of Merchants, or by whom?—The Guild of Merchants have nothing to do with it; they are elected by the Lord Mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, and commons of the city.

Have they any fees for the use of their tubs?—They have fees, which I believe amount to about 7*s.* 3½*d.* for the use of their tubs on each ship. Neither I nor Mr. Howard have any fee whatever on tubs.

By whom are such fees collected?—By Mr. Hamerton, in the Custom House.

Are the tubs sealed?—They are.

Who seals the tubs?—The clerk of the market.

Who appoints the clerk of the market?—The Lord Mayor for the time being, but they seldom remove him.

Then the Corporation of Dublin having the right of appointing the water-bailiffs, and the Lord Mayor for the time being having the right of appointing the clerk of the market, has the Guild of Merchants any control over those officers?—Not the smallest; the water-bailiffs are amenable to the Corporation, and the clerk of the market to the Lord Mayor.

Then it is your opinion that the citizens of Dublin are fully protected in the purchase of coals by having the measurers appointed by one public body, and the persons appointed to control the measures by another?—Perfectly so; for if they have any complaints against an officer of one of those establishments, there are proper authorities for redressing them, and without any expense attending it.

What number of coal-ships were discharged in the Port of Dublin in each of the years 1819, 1820 and 1821?—It is contained in the return which I have delivered in, as well as the number of tons, and the amount of the coal-meters wages.

Are not the coal-factors in the habit of yarding or storing coals direct from the ship?—They are.

State the number of tons of coal so stored, on an average, in the years 1819, 1820, and 1821?—I suppose on an average not less than from 10 to 15,000 tons.

How many tons of coals so stored were measured out to the public in each of those years in the presence of coal-meters, and out of what number of coal-yards?—It will appear by the return that there were 36 yards attended to in one year, and five or six in the other; in the year 1821 there was no return; there were some coals sold out of one yard, and the master porter was to be settled with for his metage, which has not yet been done, and therefore I did not get an account of it.

Then it does not appear that the coal-meters were allowed to attend in those coal-yards?—The owners of coal-yards prevent them, though they are particularly

anxious

anxious when yarding coals from the ships to have master porters on the ships to see them measured, as the Committee may perceive by a letter from a person of the name of St. Ledger, a coal-factor.

Mr. Richard Oulton. (26 May.)

[*The Witness produced the same.*]

Are not the coal-factors or dealers, when they purchase coals from the ship for the purpose of yarding them, extremely desirous to have the support of the coal-meters in measuring them?—They are; and the above document will attest it; it is from Mr. St. Ledger, who wrote to me particularly to desire me to have a coal-meter on a ship.

Have not many of them resisted that superintendence or inspection over their own measurement, when vending those coals to the public out of their own yards?—Several of them. There are some very respectable persons among the coal-factors, but there are many of them not so: those of the latter description, previous to sending coals out from their yards, lock up the yards, and fill the bags as they please. If the yard should happen to be open, and a master porter goes in, the men stop immediately, and the master porter is told that they will not measure coal while he is there. They then take advantage when the master porter is away to fill the bags, and send them out as they please, which more or less affects the fair traders in that article, as well as the consumers.

Does the superintendence of the master porters extend equally to yards as to ships?—They have done so till within this year or two; until they met with the opposition from the coal-factors I have alluded to. If they were placed on all yards, I am satisfied it would be to the advantage of the fair dealers as well as the consumers, for others can undersell them by reason of deficiency in the measure.

Does not the London Coal Act require that all coals sold from the ship shall be measured in the presence of sworn coal-meters, who are required to give certificates of the quantity so measured?—They are. In confirmation of what I said respecting coal-dealers in Dublin refusing to admit the coal-meters, I have here a letter, signed by several of them, calling a meeting at the corn-exchange for the purpose.

Are not the London coal-dealers the principal purchasers from the ships?—They are solely, in London.

Are not the coals so purchased by the coal-merchants or dealers afterwards removed to their wharfs or barges, in which they remain till sold?—They are.

Does not the London Coal Act require all coals sold at those wharfs to be measured in the presence of a coal-meter?—It does, and gives them sixpence per chaldron metage, as appears by the 102d sec. of the London Coal Act of 47th Geo. 3d, which does not include the metage on delivering them from the ship.

Does not that act also impose a penalty, and render a coal-meter for ever after incapable of acting, if he suffers any quantity of coal, exceeding eight bushels, to go from any wharf without being first measured by a standard bushel?—Yes.

Are not the glass manufacturers of Dublin, and the proprietors of salt-works at Ringsend, particularly desirous, when they purchase coals from the ship, to have the superintendence of coal-meters over the measurement of them?—They are. It will appear from this certificate what the glass manufacturers opinion is.

[*The witness produced the same.*]

Are not the coals always discharged from the ship at the pier of Dunleary under the superintendance of coal-meters from your establishment?—They are; the reason of it was that some years ago the meters appointed by the local authorities there who had done duty at Dunleary, were so very deficient in their attention, that the magistrates of the Rathdown association applied for the meters of Dublin, and I sent meters to do the duty there, and they have continued there eight or ten years, to the general satisfaction of the association and the neighbourhood. The coal meters have no additional allowance whatever for this service, though it is upwards of six miles from Dublin. The London Coal Act gives the meter 10*s.* 6*d.* for travelling expenses when employed in any ship below Greenwich.

Have you not received several applications from different gentlemen to have the superintendence of coal-meters for the measurement of coals?—Many from the country. I had applications from the Rev. Mr. Trench, the rector of Swords, when laying in coals for the poor, and I sent down there at different times; and there is a letter of thanks from him for the attention of the master porters when on duty for him.

The

[*The witness produced the same.*]

Mr. Richard Oulton. (26 May.)

I sent to Colonel White, as well as others, a master porter to measure coals for him in the country at his own desire.

Does not a measured ton of coal in Dublin consist of sixteen half-barrels?—It does.

Is not coal measured without streaking?—It is; the revenue law requires that all coal should be measured according to the custom of the port; the custom of the port of Dublin is without streaking, and the Commissioners act under that.

Are not the coal-tubs almost uniformly filled in the ship by the ship's crew, who take it in turn with those at the windlass?—They are; there may be some few instances in which a man not of the crew is employed occasionally to measure. It has been stated in a printed paper, which I have read, intitled "Charges on the importation of coal in the city of Dublin," that artful measurers in the hold received 6,686*l.* 15*s.* in the year ending January 1822, which is a mere invention of some interested person, and not founded in fact; and I believe that many of the sums therein are miscalculated, and that others of them are not existing ones, and equally fallacious as the one I have mentioned, and among others 1,250*l.* metage paid on coals in dealers stores, whereas no metage has been paid on them for upwards of two years: 106,988*l.* for freight of coals is introduced also to swell the charges.

State as nearly as you can the proportion which a Dublin-measured ton of coal bears to a London chaldron?—About a ton and a fifth.

What is about the average price of a ton of the best Whitehaven coal in Dublin, including delivery?—About 24*s.* Irish.

What is the price of the best Newcastle coal in London, including delivery?—About 3*l.*, British per chaldron, which is a ton and one fifth, Dublin measure. Since I came, they were near 3*l.* 10*s.*; they are reduced since; but I was talking to a coal merchant here, and he said that in general the best coals could not be sold in London under 3*l.* at any time.

Did not the Commissioners of Customs, for the purpose of collecting the Customs and Wide-street duty on coals in the port of Dublin, direct the weight of a measured ton of each description of coal imported, to be ascertained?—They did.

Were they not measured and weighed in the presence of one of the Commissioners?—They were, twice; the first time I attended, Mr. Hutchinson, one of the Commissioners was present. The second time he and the surveyor-general, and a clerk from the Custom House, as also the Lord Mayor and the water-bailiffs were present.

State the weight of a measured ton of coal of the several kinds?—A measured ton of Whitehaven coals weighs 21 cwt. 3 qrs. and 12 lbs.; a measured ton of Irvine coal weighs 21 cwt. 16 lbs., a measured ton of Troone coal is 21 cwt. 1 qr. and 4 lbs.; a measured ton of Chester and Liverpool coals weighs 21 cwt. 1 qr. 20 lbs.; a measured ton of Harrington and Workington weighs 23 cwt. 2 qrs. and 8 lbs.; a measured ton of Glasgaw coals weighs 22 cwt. and 16 lbs.; a measured ton of Swansea coals weighs 23 cwt.; a measured ton of Maryport coals weighs 24 cwt. 1 qr. and 4 lbs., which latter is the worst house coal that comes to Dublin.

Then the Committee are to understand, that, according to the usual way of measuring coal, a measured ton of Whitehaven coal weighs 1 cwt. 3 qrs. and 12 lbs., and a measured ton of Maryport coal weighs 4 cwt. 1 qr. and 4 lbs. more than a ton by weight?—Yes.

Is not Maryport coal one of the worst descriptions of coal imported into Dublin?—It is.

And Whitehaven the best?—It is, for house use.

Then it appears if the coal was sold by weight, that it would be the interest of the importers to import the worst instead of the best?—No doubt of it; he could have more weight in less bulk, and at a cheaper rate at the pits.

Was there not a representation made by Mr. Curwen to the Lords of the Treasury, stating the hardship that existed in paying the duty by weight, inasmuch as the worst coal paid the most duty?—There was. Here is Mr. Curwen's letter on the subject, dated 1st May 1816.

[*The witness produced the same.*]

It states that the worst coal which comes into Dublin paid the highest duty, on account of its being so much heavier.

What was the result of that representation?—The letter was referred to the Coal Committee of the Guild of Merchants; they called upon me to give my opinion, and I did so, by saying, that to relieve Mr. Curwen's collieries from that great difficulty, Mr. Richard Oulton. (26 May.)

ficulty, that it would be the best way to permit those coals to pay the same duty that the Whitehaven did, and that was recommended to the Lords of the Treasury; and the Lords of the Treasury wrote to Mr. Curwen, and he was perfectly satisfied; and that regulation has continued for upwards of seven years, and still continues.

You have already stated that it is a part of the duty of the coal-meters to cheque the quantity delivered from the ship, with a view to the collection of the Custom and Wide-street duty on coals; when was that regulation first adopted?—I think it was first adopted about nine or ten years ago, and it is most effectually followed up, as will appear from the increase of the duties.

By whose order was it so adopted?—By the Commissioners of Customs and Wide Streets having applied to the Coal Committee for that purpose.

Have not the Commissioners of Customs given orders to their surveyors and inspectors not to allow any coal-vessels to be discharged during the time allowed to the coal-meters for breakfast and dinner?—They did, and they have followed that up by new regulations in the Custom House, by making a positive order that the quay-officers shall attend, and not allow ships to discharge during the absence of the master porter, or during his breakfast or dinner-time.

Have not those regulations greatly increased the duty both to the Crown and to the Commissioners of Wide Streets?—They have, to the amount of fourteen or fifteen thousand a-year.

Is it not your opinion that strict attention on this subject on the part of the coal-meters has made them extremely unpopular with those persons concerned in the importation of coals?—It has made them extremely unpopular with many of the coal-factors, but to the public and the revenue I think they are quite the reverse.

Did not Mr. Hamerton, the Jerquer of the Customs, give it as his opinion that the coal-meters were the only check the revenue had on vessels discharging their coals?—He did, and I have his certificate here to that effect.

Produce that certificate?—

[*The Witness produced the same, which was read as follows:*]

" I certify that the measuring porters are the only checque the revenue has in the discharge of vessels trading with coals in the port of Dublin, and is of essential benefit to the collection of the duty.

The quantity reported to the clerk of the ship's entries, (a transcript of which I keep,) was from the 3d of January twenty, to the 3d of February twenty, 15,902 tons; and the actual quantity certified by the meters to have been discharged was 21,677 tons, 9 cwt. 0 qrs. 20 lbs. being 5,795 tons, 9 cwt. 0 qrs. 20 lbs. more than would be ascertained by the Custom Department, the increase duty being 794*l.* 2*s.* 10*d.* In no instance can the master of a coal-vessel obtain a clearance until the duty is paid for the overplus, which is done by a post-entry being first compared with the meters returns, and certified by me. The duty averaged by the month, above stated, would amount to 9,429*l.* 5*s.* per annum."

William Hamerton, Jerquer.

March 14, 1820.

Have you any certificate from the Commissioners of Wide Streets, showing the increase of duties payable to them in consequence of these regulations?—I have.

In your opinion, was it the purchaser of coals, or the proprietor of the ship, who benefited by the payment of short duty; or did the regulations enhance the price of coals on the consumer?—The importer of the coals and the captains had the benefit that arose from paying the short duty; it did not raise the price. At the time that it first took place coals were from 28*s.* to 30*s.* per ton, the captains were then making such a great profit; they were so perfectly reconciled with it, that they did not raise the price of coals.

Has not the attention of the coal-meters in keeping a strict tally on the ship been the principal cause of opposition on the part of the coal-factors to them?—I have no doubt of it that it is a principal cause.

Did not some of the coal-factors call a meeting of those interested in the coal-trade, for the purpose of resisting the coal-meters; and did not several respectable coal-factors decline attending such meeting?—They did; several of them declined having any thing to do with it.

Did any of them proceed to serve notices on the coal-meters, cautioning the coal-meters from going on board vessels?—There is one of the printed notices.

[*The witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

Notice to Master Measuring Porters.

"Sir,

"I hereby give you notice that I do not require your attendance as master measuring porter for the discharge of coals now on board the vessel called the Unity of Dublin, lying in the harbour of Dublin; and I caution you not to come on board the said vessel, as if you do after this notice I shall bring an action against you for such trespass. Dated this 23d day of August 1820.

"To Mr. John Murray, "*John Tomlinson.*"
on board the schooner, Unity,

Was it with the view of benefiting themselves, or for the advantage of the purchasers of coal, that they called such meeting?—It was with a view of benefiting themselves.

Do not those factors alluded to resist the coal-meters superintending the measurement of coals in their yards?—They do.

Whenever coals have been seized in the street for deficient measure, has it not almost invariably appeared that the coals so seized had been sent out of coal-yards?—It generally does. There had been some coal lately seized that left the quays, and those coals were pillaged by what are called pickaroons on the quays.

What are the pickaroons?—They are the wives and children of the coal-porters.

Are not all coals bought at the pits by measure?—They are, as appears by Mr. Curwen's letter.

Do not coals often lie a considerable time, particularly in bad weather, on the banks of the pit, previous to their being shipped?—They do; for while the ships are in Dublin the colliers are employed at the pits raising coals, which remain on the banks till shipped.

Are not coals liable to have their weight increased by being exposed to wet and rain?—I have no doubt of it.

If vessels on their passage to Dublin laden with coals should ship water, and the coals were to be sold to the consumer by weight, would not the consumer have to pay for the weight of the water so shipped?—He would have to pay for the weight of water absorbed by the coal.

Did not a captain of a Whitehaven coal-ship inform you, that having at one time shipped a cargo of coal of the usual quantity, which he had shipped after bad weather, that he had ascertained by the draught of the ship that the cargo must have absorbed upwards of twenty ton of water previous to his taking it on board?—He did.

Do not the captains on that account take a less quantity of coals on board in winter than in summer?—They do; for in winter the coals are so wet that they cannot take within several tons of what they do in summer.

As the ship-owners profits arise from the number of voyages the vessel makes, is it not for the advantage of the ship, as she returns in ballast, to have her cargo quickly discharged?—Certainly.

Does not that desire often induce the captains to dispose of the coals at a reduced price?—It certainly does.

Would there be a more considerable delay in discharging a cargo of coal by weight than by measure; and would it not require a greater number of hands to do it?—It would. I have a certificate from Mr. Williams and others, glass manufacturers, to that effect; they are of opinion, that a ship would not be able to discharge above thirty tons by weight in the time they can discharge sixty tons by measure, and in consequence of the delay, that it would raise the price of coals, as well as the price of delivering them.

In the confusion of discharging vessels on Dublin quays, where six or seven ships are sometimes discharging one over the other, do you think that coals could be accurately weighed on board?—I am satisfied that they could not, nor do they even weigh them on board in Cork, for they often throw them out on the quays altogether, and then weigh them; and even that could not be done on Dublin quays from the number of ships at times discharging, and the number of cars and drays on the quays.

If in selling coal by weight the captains were delayed in discharging their cargoes, would it not have the effect of raising the price of coals on the consumer?—I have no doubt that for all the delay that the captain is under he always takes care to lay on an additional price.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

Does not the consumer save an advance of price by dealing directly with the ship?—I have not a doubt of it.

If the coal-trade of Dublin should be thrown entirely into the hands of factors or dealers, would it not encourage a number of fraudulent dealers to set up in the trade, who would be enabled by their frauds to undersell the fair traders?—Most assuredly.

State your reasons?—If they got the trade entirely into their hands they would yard the best kinds of coal, and they would sell them out to the public as they do at present, for the worst price, when they have an opportunity. Towards the latter end of the year they generally yard a quantity of coals, about ten or fifteen thousand tons, and then they hold over till an increased price comes from scarcity of ships. They generally more than double their profit on the yarding of coal. I have known coals to be yarded at 20*s.* 6*d.* and sold out for 2*l.* 10*s.*

In buying coals direct from the ship, would not the consumer derive the advantage of a fall in the price much sooner from the ship than if he was obliged to buy from the coal-yards?—I am certain that the purchaser would have the advantage much sooner from the ship; a sudden change of the wind will affect the price, from the expectation that coal-vessels may arrive the next tide after.

In the manner in which coals are brought to market at present, cannot the consumer purchase direct from the ship any quantity, from half a barrel upwards, and have them measured under the superintendence of the coal-meters?—He can.

Do not the consumers, when they go on board to purchase coals, ask for a coal-meter?—They do in general, and there are very few who go on board that do not ask for them immediately.

In your opinion, is a fraud in the sale of coals easier to be detected in measure than in weight?—It is much easier by measure, for all that is to be attended to in the measurement is the filling the tub; if they were weighed, they could not judge whether the weights were correct, or any thing about it.

Why could not they ascertain whether the weights were correct?—If the weights were light, how could a buyer tell whether they were so or not.

Why could not they have the weights correct as well as the measures correct?—Every coal-meter is ordered by the Coal Committee, when called upon by the buyer, to measure the tubs if the buyer doubts that the tubs are correct, he would not have that power with the weights. By Act of Parliament it is made imperative to measure coals; there is no option; they must invariably measure the coals.

How many bags are there to a ton of coal?—Sixteen.

Do not you think, it would be very difficult for an illiterate servant to superintend the buying of coals by weight?—No doubt.

Much more than by measure?—They would have no means of knowing whether the weight, or the amount, were correct or not; whereas in bags by measure they know the number, and have a very good idea whether the coals are measure or not, by the size of the bags.

Are you aware how coals are sold in London?—By the chaldron.

Is not the chaldron a quantity by measure, and not by weight?—By measure.

In a city like London, where coals are at all times more than double the price of coals in Dublin, and where there is six times the quantity used, do you not think that the housekeepers of London would long since have sought to have coals vended by weight instead of measure, if they could obtain any advantage from it?—I am perfectly satisfied of it; and I have had conversation with several of them, and they have spoken against any thing like weighing coals; and the officers over the coal-meters, with whom I had conversation, were of the same opinion also; and that all the respectable coal-dealers are most anxious to have the superintendence of coal-meters over their wharfs, to prevent the injury that would otherwise arise to them from fraudulent dealers.

Has it not come within your observation that it is a convenience to the poorer description of persons, particularly in the outlets of Dublin, to buy coals from what are called bell-cars?—It has.

If coals were to be sold by weight, how could they ascertain the correctness of the weight, or guard against their buying them wetted?—They would not have any opportunity of knowing the correctness of the weights at all; they form a tolerable good opinion as to the measure, by the size of the bags.

Have not the coal-meters been frequently assaulted in consequence of their exertions in detecting the frauds and practices in the sale of coals?—Frequently; I have been under the necessity of calling upon the police to protect them.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(26 May.)

Is there not an office on the quay where any complaints are heard against coal-meters?—There is; my office is on the quay, where I am ready to attend to any complaint, and if I refused doing so a complaint can be at any time made of me to the Guild.

Have you ever refused to redress any complaint made to you against the coal-meters establishment?—Never; so far as lay in my power, and in any case that I could not do it effectually, I regularly reported it to the Coal Committee, and Mr. Howard does the same.

When a complaint is made to you or the inspector, does not one or other of you go immediately on board the ship to have it redressed?—When a complaint is made, either Mr. Howard or I go on board the ship to see the cause of complaint, and if it is the fault of the master porter, he or I take him off the ship immediately; suspend him; put another master porter on, and report to the Coal Committee, who investigate the complaint; if his conduct is such as requires dismissal, the Committee report him to the Guild of Merchants at large.

Have the Coal Committee ever refused to listen to such a complaint?—Never; they sit once a month, or oftener, if necessary, to hear complaints.

Does not that Committee act gratuitously?—They have no emolument whatever, nor has the Guild of Merchants any emolument, except something on the election of the coal-meters.

Does not the Corporation of London exercise the right of appointing coal-meters?—They do.

Does it not derive a considerable emolument from the metage on coals?—Very considerable.

You have returned upwards of 250,000 tons of coals, as sold by measure in Dublin, in each of the last three years; if the same quantity of coals were sold by weight, what difference would it make as against the consumer, between that and the measure, at the average price of 21 *s.* a ton?—It would make a difference of about 15½ per cent on the entire.

You think the Citizens of Dublin, then, would lose about 26,000 *l.* a year, if a different standard for the sale of coals was established?—If that alteration was made and no fraud was practised, they would lose about 26,000 *l.* a year. If wetting, and other frauds were practised, which captains and others might do, it would perhaps run up to 60 or 70,000 *l.* a year.

Are you yourself a coal-meter?—No, indeed, I am not; I have no emolument but what I stated before.

Do you receive half the fees for a ship?—No, I do not; nor ever did.

Have you any emoluments whatever from the metage, except what you have already stated?—I have not.

Directly or indirectly?—None, but what I have stated already.

Have the coal-factors in Dublin ever made any complaint to the Committee respecting the conduct of the coal-meters in their yards?—They have complained; but on investigating it before the Committee they found there was no ground for complaint whatsoever; but the great complaint of the coal-factors I have alluded to against the master porters is because they would not allow them to send what measure they pleased out of the yard. They wanted to send out deficient measures, and the coal-meters wanted to send out good measure.

Did they make any complaint of the personal conduct of any individual?—Yes, I believe they did; I believe they complained once of a man of the name of Ross, which on investigation proved to be quite incorrect.

The question was investigated?—It was. They have complained of many master porters, and it is on the face of the books where there are different investigations before the Committee respecting coal-meters.

There is a man of the name of Ross, a coal-measurer?—There is.

What duty does he do?—He attends the duty of measuring coals at Ringsend, and any other efficient duty that I want him to attend to.

Does he do the duty of Mr. Howard, the inspector?—No; he never does.

Is Mr. Howard required to do his duty?—He is delicate at present, as I stated before; but when in health he does his duty most efficiently.

Are the ships that are put on more than sufficient to pay Ross his salary?—They do not pay it, and I was in advance to him on my leaving Dublin.

With respect to the Cork Coal Regulation Act, there is one circumstance I beg to mention relative to it. It does not answer the expectations which were held out there. The coals the consumers were formerly in the habit of getting were from

Newport,

Mr. *Richard Oulton.* (26 May.)

Newport, and mostly bought by them direct from the ship. They get now the Maryport coal, which is the heaviest and the worst description of coals. The consumers not having it in their power, as formerly, to go to the ships to buy coals, they are now obliged to take their coals from the coal-factors, which are weighed on the quays or in their stores, and the coals have been much dearer since the act passed. Since I left Dublin, there was a Mr. James Lyons (who has the contract for barracks in the vicinity of Cork) came to Dublin to try if he could freight vessels from Whitehaven to go to Cork, to deliver coals for the supply of the barracks there, according to the custom of Dublin measure, as he was a great sufferer by buying by weight in Cork, and obliged to deliver by measure, and which I think is conclusive against selling coals by weight, if there was no other objection to that mode of vending them, and of which I have stated many.

Mr. George Nugent, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *George Nugent.*

HAVE you at any time acted as secretary to the Lord Mayor of Dublin?—Yes, in the year 1820 and 1821.

Who is the escheator or clerk of the markets in Dublin?—The Lord Mayor.

Before whom are any examinations upon charges of deficient measures in coals brought?—When coals are seized in the streets for deficient measure, they are, I believe, always brought before the Lord Mayor, for the purpose of ascertaining if they are so or not. I think the magistrates might possibly exercise that power, but I believe they scarcely ever do.

In the course of the time that you were secretary to the Lord Mayor how many cases of that sort came before him?—I think not more than eight or ten.

Were any of those coals so seized condemned for being deficient n measure?—I believe every ton seized was condemned for deficient measure.

Dit it appear to you whether the coals so seized came from ships, or from coal-yards?—They appeared to come from coal-yards. The Lord Mayor administered an oath to the factor when he attended. In one case the factor stated, that the coals which were seized and brought before the Lord Mayor were going to his country house; and when examined as to the fact, it appeared, that instead of going in the direction of his country house, they were going in a different direction to where it lay.

During those years were there any complaints made on the subject of corn?—There were several.

What was the nature of those complaints?—One description of complaint, and which was very general, was, that the corn delivered was not according to the sample, and the other was delivering short weight; and frequently there was a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining the frauds, for the carriers, in most instances, started the corn into the purchaser's stores or binns, in their absence, without waiting for the purchaser's examination of either the corn or the weight. It is the gentry of Dublin who are most defrauded in weight, for it is well known they have neither scales or weights and even if they had, they could not get their servants to use them.

They gave false samples?—Yes, they delivered by false samples, and sometimes deficient weight, and sometimes both together.

Did you ever know any complaint brought before the Lord Mayor on the subject of hay?—Yes; hay is weighed by a machine in Smithfield; it is packed or put on carts the day or the evening before, and it is subject in rainy weather to absorb the wet which may fall on it from the time it is loaded until it is sold in the market the next day, more particularly in the winter season. We had frequent complaints of this nature, which the clerks of the market (who I believe are very attentive to their duty) could not redress; and many difficulties stand in the way of the Lord Mayor doing it either.

Hay is sold by weight?—It is.

Are you aware of any difficulty that stands in the way of detecting false weights in the city of Dublin?—There is. There may possibly be forty or fifty places in a line of street, or along the quays, where weights are in use. As soon as the Lord Mayor or clerk of the market enter into a yard or place where there is a number of weights to be ascertained, and while they are detained there, if there are any fraudulent weights in the other yards or places in the same line, they are all removed out of the way.

Are

Mr. George Nugent.

(26 May.)

Are you aware of beams and scales ever having been seized?—I have been present at their seizure in the liberties of Dublin, where Mr. Poppelwell was one of the market jurors. I saw him seizing beams and scales which appeared to me to balance. I asked him the reason for seizing them, and it was that one arm of the beam was longer than the other, and that the long-arm side would take much less to turn it than the weight at the opposite one.

What are the weights in general made of in the city of Dublin?—Cast-metal.

Are they cast to the exact standards, or how are they made equal to standard weights?—They are, I believe, always cast under the standard.

What is the mode of adjusting them?—There is a ring attached to large weights in the centre by a staple, and a hollow is left round it, in which probably a pound or more of lead is put, to adjust it to the standard, the greater part of which may be cut away without removing the standard mark.

Are you a housekeeper in Dublin?—I am.

In what parish do you reside?—In the parish of St. Peter.

Have you ever purchased coals directly from the ship?—Several times.

Have you ever been supplied from a coal-yard?—Yes.

Had you any reason for preferring one mode to another?—I always preferred to buy from a ship, because I considered there was more fair dealing there than in a coal-yard, where coals are often mixed; and I was sure to get Whitehaven coal from the ship. In one instance in which I purchased from a coal-yard, my servant informed me the coals were put into the bags without measuring them at all, after which I stopped dealing there.

Have you read the petition of St. Mary's parish on the subject of coals?—I have.

Do you live in that parish?—No; in the parish of St. Peter's.

Do you consider that as the *bonâ fide* petition of St. Mary's parish?—I do not, because three of the Committee told me that there was a resolution of the parish, appointing thirteen persons, then named, as the committee of that parish, and that the reports made were signed only by six out of the thirteen; that in order to pass the reports under the original resolution, a member of an increased committee of twenty was procured to sign them after they were printed; so that as the reports stand, neither a majority of the original committee, or of the increased one, signed them. The petition founded on these reports was drawn up, and called the petition of the parish of St. Mary's, though thirteen of the committee out of twenty refused to adopt the reports.

Have you read the petitions from the other parishes?—I have, all that are printed.

Have any others of them made any representation on the subject of coals?—None; but in that of St. Mary's parish, and which, from information I received, I believe to have been introduced by a person who is or was himself an importer of coal, or dealer therein, and in corn, and who has been in frequent communication with coal-factors who attend the Corn Exchange.

Are you a housekeeper in St. Peter's parish?—I am.

Did you attend any meeting in that parish on the subject of local taxation?—I did.

Were any resolutions, or petition, agreed to at that meeting?—There were.

Was the petition signed by the churchwardens?—It was not.

Why did the churchwardens refuse to sign it?—Because it did not agree with the resolutions passed at the meeting.

What became of the petition after they refused to sign it?—I do not know. I heard there was some petition from St. Peter's presented to Parliament; but I never saw it, nor do I apprehend that it has been printed.

Do you consider that the recommendation of St. Mary's parish to sell coal by weight instead of by measure would be an advantage to the citizens of Dublin?—I think not. With respect to measure, the only deceit that can be practised on board ship is, that it may be deficient; but with respect to weight, it would induce many frauds to be committed, such as adding to the weight of coals by wetting, and adulteration. The encouragement it would give to the importation of the worst coal, as it weighs the heaviest, and lies in the smallest bulk. The storing of coal, which would in time exclude the purchase altogether from the ship, as I have been credibly informed it has done already in Cork, and encourage the use of fraudulent weights, which I think it would be impossible to check or control, for the Lord Mayor and clerks of the markets have told me that they have several times seized weights in yards and stores in one week; and in the same places before another week again.

Mr. George Nugent.

(26 May.)

Do you think selling coals by weight would afford any advantage to monopolists in the article of coal?—It would drive the consumer from the ship, from the delay and great difficulty of weighing coals on board, and consequently he would have to buy out of coal-yards, which would give the factors or dealers in that article a monopoly, and it is what many of them, I believe, are seeking for.

Do you think that purchasers would be more liable to fraud in the quality of the coal?—They must, when stored in coal-yards, be more liable to be mixed and sold under false denominations, and of course, even without the intention of fraud, be exposed to rain; but which would always furnish an excuse to the seller when the purchaser complained of their being wet.

That is, inferior coal sold instead of good coal?—Yes, to the injury of the fair trader as well as the consumer.

Then as long as you were in office as secretary to the Lord Mayor, you never heard an instance of a single detection of deficient measure in the coals bought in the ships?—Never.

Does all the hay and straw that comes into Smithfield pay for being weighed?—Yes.

Every load that comes into the market pays?—It does.

What does it pay?—I never asked the price, the seller pays for weighing.

It is fixed?—There are regular tables of prices for weighing hay.

Do you conceive that the purchaser of coals might not get his fair weight if coals were sold by weight, as in the case of hay?—A purchaser may be defrauded in the same way in coals, as in hay (which is sold by weight); for if coals get wet, either through accident, or were deficient in weight, it would operate against the purchaser of the one article, as well as the other. In hay you cannot well be deceived as to its quality, in coal you certainly can; but much less so on board ship than in store-yards.

You have stated that the petition of Saint Peter's was not signed by the churchwardens?—Yes, they both objected, on the ground that it did not agree with the resolutions of the meeting.

Do you mean to state that there were no grounds of complaint in the parish?—There certainly were grounds of complaint in the parish, but they were stated in the resolutions which passed at the meeting, to which I have alluded, but none on the subject of coals. The general complaint among housekeepers about coals, is that there is too much slack mixed with them; and slack is an article which, in my opinion, it would be difficult to artfully measure.

Martis, 27° *die Maii*, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Richard Oulton again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(27 May.)

YOU stated that there were 80 coal meters?—Yes, there are 80 on actual duty.

Are there not some additional ones?—No; there are some superannuated ones, who are old or debilitated, I think about 19 in number; and 19 out of the 80 meters, who are the juniors or latest elected, do the duty for those 19 superannuated ones, which only makes 80 men in all on actual duty; and the 19 junior meters pay half of the metage money of the ships on which they are put on duty, to the superannuated men; and when any one of the superannuated meters dies, the senior of the present 19 junior meters will be appointed to full metage, which is a promotion that encourages proper conduct in the meters.

Is there not 6 *d.* out of the stores on the same coal?—I stated, that the metage is 6 *d.* per ton from the ships; the storage of coals is not more than from 10,000 to 15,000 tons a year. Latterly the coal factors have shut up their yards, and sent out their coals, when the coal meter was not present; but formerly what quantity used to be stored in their yards, they paid 6 *d.* per ton metage on the delivery to purchasers; but for two years and upwards the coals so stored have paid no metage money, nor has the consumer had the advantage of the coal meter's superintendence.

You know nothing of the trial of Russell *versus* Mac Dermot?—I attended in the court

Mr. Richard Oulton.

(27 May.)

court of King's Bench, but know very little about the particular points to which they relate.

What was the trial about, upon what grounds?—The object I believe was, that they wanted to do away with the meters, so necessary for protecting the public; there was also a trial at the court of conscience; and an action brought against the president of that court, in which the party did not proceed, and there was an order or judgment of the court against him with costs, in consequence of not proceeding, for there was no ground to go upon. Mr. Allen, the clerk of the guild, has I believe given evidence before the Committee, as to the nature and particulars of the trial.

Is not the meter supposed to live well on board, at the expense of the captain?—No; if he did, it would be my duty to report him to the committee, and he would be dismissed. There is a standing order on the guild books, that a meter shall not dine, nor take any compliment from the captain; if he does, he must do it in a clandestine manner, and be subject to suspension or dismissal. If a complaint from any individual on the subject was made to me, I should immediately report it to the coal committee, who, as I before stated, are ready to hear and redress all complaints brought before them.

Major James Palmer, called in; and Examined.

Major James Palmer.

WHERE do you reside?—In Dublin.

What is your official situation?—Inspector general of the prisons in Ireland.

As inspector general of the prisons, is it your duty to visit the prisons of the city of Dublin?—It is.

Have you inspected those prisons?—I have.

Have you inspected those prisons alone, or in communication with another officer?—Generally in company with Major Woodward, who is also inspector general.

You have presented a report to Parliament this session?—I have.

In that report, in as much of it as refers to the prisons of Dublin, is it your separate report, or the joint report of the two inspectors general?—It is a joint report; we agreed it should be so, as we inspected together.

The other parts of that report are taken singly, by each of the inspectors general?—They are, the Lord Lieutenant having divided Ireland into two circuits, under the Act of Parliament.

At what time were you appointed?—At Christmas 1821.

Did you pay an early attention to the state of the prisons in Dublin?—Immediate, almost.

Did you see anything in the state of Newgate which led you to make a representation to the King's government in Ireland, with regard to a new classification of prisoners?—We certainly saw much to find fault with; but we did not make a representation to government at once, considering it would take some time to inform ourselves as to the duty and necessary alterations.

Then you proceeded deliberately on your introduction, before you came to a decision with regard to the measures of reform in those prisons?—We did, conscious of our own ignorance, in a great measure, at first, on many parts of our duty.

What was the state of Newgate at the time when your official duties commenced?—It appeared to us in a very bad state of discipline, in a great measure arising from the nature of its structure, and want of accommodation for the occupation of prisoners.

Did you consider it possible, that any prison, built like the prison of Newgate, that the provisions of the law can be carried into effect?—The law could not, in all its provisions, be enforced; but we did consider, that much more could be done than was done; and in fact great improvement has taken place in the female department by the appointment of a matron, and in the general classification, by the Lord Lieutenant's proclamation under the late Act.

Do you conceive, that, in any prison circumstanced like Newgate, a system of correct classification can be carried into effect?—Certainly not to the extent which I should consider a perfect classification; but an improvement could be made, and is in progress.

Is not the enactment of the law distinct and clear which specifies, that the criminal and the debtor shall not, under any circumstances, be allowed to be placed in the same part of the prison?—Quite so, I think.

Was that provision of the law carried into effect in the prison of Newgate, or have you known any failing of it?—It was not carried into effect in Newgate.

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

In what particulars was that provision of the law violated or neglected?—The governor was in the habit of renting rooms in that part of the prison that was allotted to debtors, to such criminals as could pay for them; I do not say in all cases, for there might have been some recommendation from other quarters for what I know. I am ignorant of that, but frequently I found criminals in that part of the prison paying for the rooms, therefore I presume it was in proportion to their capacity to pay.

Will you state any particular instances?—The instances I allude to was very soon after my appointment; at one period of visiting Newgate, Major Woodward and I discovered in the debtors rooms the carpenters, who were confined in the case of Mr. Cardlane, a master carpenter, and it was not denied that the prisoners paid for the accommodation; the governor did not consider it wrong I imagine.

Was that a case of combination?—I think it was.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that in this case of combination, that it occurs in Ireland very frequently for a provision to be made for the maintenance of the individual who is apprehended by those connected with him in the conspiracy out of doors?—I have heard so, but I do not know it otherwise.

Are the Committee to understand from the evidence which you have given, that this charge of rent for rooms at the debtors side of the prison, as made against criminals, that the keeper of the prison had a direct interest in the violation of the law; that he received a pecuniary compensation for the violation of the law?—I think he had; but I am not of opinion that he was aware that he was violating the law.

Did you see any other case of a similar nature?—I did; but I cannot call to mind the particular case, but it frequently occurred, and was admitted to be so.

Is there not an inspector appointed for that prison?—There is one local inspector for all the prisons in Dublin, and his duty is very arduous.

You are the chief officer, you and Major Woodward, of the department in Ireland, and as such you receive reports from the local inspectors in Ireland, do you not?—We do.

Have you turned your mind to the duties which are required to be performed by the local inspectors by law of prisons generally?—Certainly, I have.

Do you conceive it to be the duty of the local inspector of a prison, to see that the regulations of the law are carried into full effect in the prison, for which he is appointed to act?—I think so, I should consider his place useless without it, or as nearly useless.

Have you received any reports officially from the local inspector of the Dublin prisons, since your appointment?—Frequently.

Did that local inspector ever represent to you the violation of the law which took place in this important point of the admixture of criminal prisoners and debtors?—I think not; Major Woodward and I discovered it ourselves in the first instance.

Do you conceive a local inspector of a prison to have an authority to prevent such a violation of the law, if he should think fit?—I think he has; I consider the court of King's Bench would support him, if his orders were disobeyed in such a case.

There is a general recommendation, a statement in your report with regard to the medical department of the prisons of Dublin; can you state from recollection what that is?—I know there is one, but I could not state from recollection; I should be glad to have my memory refreshed upon it by seeing the Report.

Do the inspectors-general of prisons in Ireland, consider the medical expenses of the Dublin prisons and the medical establishment, to stand in need of reform and amendment?—We consider them capable of reform, of amendment I would rather say.

Do you consider the medical expenses of the prisons of the city of Dublin to be capable of reduction and retrenchment?—A considerable retrenchment I think.

Without any sacrifice of the duty which society owes to the individuals confined in the prisons?—On the contrary, I think it would be with benefit to them; but this is a view of our's, that wemay be mistaken in.

But it is your view, in connection with that of your brother officer?—Certainly; we have considered the subject seriously, and have consulted others on the subject, we have gone considerable lengths in it; we consulted the surgeon-general, and also some of the police magistrates of Dublin, conscious that in some of our views we might be erroneous and find them difficult to execute, and as we stated in our report, we will be prepared when we are called to produce a plan.

Is

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

Is the plan which you have in theory formed, founded on your own opinion, corrected by the advice to which you had recourse?—Certainly.

Have you examined the medical expenses of the prisons of the city of Dublin, with the medical expenses of other prisons?—We have; but I am not prepared, not being expected to be called on, to give a detailed account of it; but I am fully prepared I hope to give a general view of the plan we would propose.

The opinions you have formed, are not only grounded on your own observations on the prisons of Dublin and the advice you may have received from other quarters of high authority, but also from your view of other prisons?—A comparative view as to expenses, but not as to practice; for the practice in Dublin is the same as the practice in county gaols; they are all under the Act of Parliament.

Will you state to the Committee what are the alterations which you would be inclined to recommend?—The alterations we propose are grounded on our view that a general hospital in one of the prisons in Dublin for the sick of all, would in many cases tend to the benefit of prison discipline, and in no case do mischief; the result of that arrangement being carried into execution, would be in the first instance, giving much more room in the other crowded prisons of Dublin; it would procure in our opinion, a much greater attention at all hours to the sick, than can be paid now; for we consider that one medical man for all the prisons of Dublin, has more than he can well do ,exclusive of the advantage which we consider would arise from a resident medical man in such an hospital; we also consider that economy with respect to the medicine would arise to a large amount, by compounding it in the prison; and we have been drawn to this conclusion by a very minute view of the hospital arrangements of Dublin, and other departments, such as Madam Stephen's hospital, and such as the hospital attached to the house of industry; with the details of which I was myself particularly accquainted as being governor.

For how long?—A year and a half I was sole governor under the new Act of Parliament; the practice in the hospitals of Dublin is to have a resident apothecary, and to purchase the medicines at Apothecaries Hall, which are compounded by this apothecary in the hospitals, all which we would apply to the prison hospital; we would add the residence of one medical man who should be both surgeon and physician, as most of the surgeons of Dublin are; we considered it our duty in proposing this plan, to lay aside all feelings for local interests, presuming, as a matter of course, that that would be provided for elsewhere, but, that our duty in proposing a plan was entirely to keep our eyes fixed on the object of benefit to the department over which we were placed; with this view we would propose, that a resident surgeon, who should be a physician also, should be placed at the Richmond bridewell, where we apprehend there is abundance of hospital room for all the sick of the gaols of Dublin; and we consider a surgeon of character could be procured for a salary of 300*l.* per annum.

At what place would you propose to fix this hospital?—At the Richmond bridewell.

Do you not apprehend there would be some inconvenience from the removal of prisoners from Newgate, and the debtor prisoners to the distance of Richmond bridewell?—That had not escaped us; I apprehend it would be as easy as removing persons who are sick in Dublin, in a cart from the most distant parts to the hospitals, it might require the attendance of constables or military, as all removals of prisoners do.

Under an improved arrangement, you conceive that one medical officer resident and one resident apothecary, would be competent to the discharge of the medical duties connected with the prisons?—I think so; if a medical man was appointed who was not at the head of his profession in Dublin.

Do you conceive, at present, that it would be expedient to place as such officer, a medical gentleman who was engaged in the head of the profession?—It would not be expedient, on the contrary, I think that a young practitioner, qualified, would give more of his time than the other could possibly do, in fact, he would be there at all hours.

Have you considered at all what possible reduction would take place in the expense of medicine, by the alterations you have suggested?—We did enter minutely into such a calculation, but I have not the paper with me; I can state, however, that to the best of my recollection, we considered the saving between salary and medicines, would amount to somewhere about 1,000*l.* per annum; I may be wrong, but I can send to Major Woodward to forward to the Committee that document.

Major
James Palmer.
(27 May.)

Are you acquainted with the duties required of the apothecary by the law at present in force?—I am.

Is it the duty of the apothecary to attend the physician during his visits?—He is bound by law to do so.

Does he in point of fact do so?—He does not, he sends his apprentice to perform such operations as are ordered by the physician or surgeon.

Is the attendance of an apprentice in point of fact, the attendance given by the apothecary in the prisons in the city of Dublin; does he attend personally, or by apprentice?—He scarcely ever attends in person, on the contrary, I understood it had been much talked over and acceded to by the medical men, that he need not do so.

You have stated, that it was the duty of the local inspector, as far as in him lay, to carry the provisions of the law into effect, and that it is his duty to report to you, as inspector general; did he ever make to you any report on the subject of this violation of the law?—No, he admitted it when we asked him; we discovered it by our usual practice, at an inspection of going through all the queries which are connected with gaol discipline, in the Act of Parliament; I would add to that, that I am not attaching immediate blame to the inspector, who I believe considered it unnecessary to report that as an error, or breach of law, which the medical officers considered not necessary or useful to comply with; exclusive of which, the prison officers in general, throughout Ireland, were not prepared at once for the strictness with which we were determined to enforce all the legal enactments.

Independently of the reports, which it is his duty to make to you, was it not his duty, as local inspector, to carry the provisions of the law into full effect?—I think so, and we have frequently called on Mr. Gamble, the local inspector, to do so, and we have no reason to apprehend that Mr. Gamble sets his face at all against the performance of his duty; so far as Mr. Gamble was made acquainted with his duty, we find a readiness to co-operate with us.

But you found, in the two instances you have stated, an actual violation of the law, which was not reported to you by the local inspector, but which was discovered by yourselves in the discharge of your duties?—Certainly; and we consider, moreover, that there is a great difficulty, on account of local feelings, to obtain an officer who will complain of the neglect of duty of those that are under them, except in cases of gross neglect.

To what do you allude, when you state that local feelings make it difficult to get officers who will complain of the neglect of duty in those who are subject to rules and regulations?—I consider that the local inspector would naturally not feel pleasant, to say the least, in reporting the neglect of the apothecary to attend the physician and surgeon, as the law requires, in person.

Why?—Because it might create unpleasant feelings amongst them.

Who is the apothecary?—Mr. Craven.

Is there any control exercised by the grand juries of the city of Dublin over the prisons; have they any thing to say to the management of them; do they provide the funds for the maintenance?—They do provide the funds; I do not think they exercise any power (whatever they may have) in controlling the regulations of the prison.

By whom is the local inspector appointed?—By the grand jury.

Are you aware whether the apothecary, Mr. Craven, is one of the individuals who have been accustomed to serve on these grand juries?—I am not; I never heard it.

Who is the surgeon of the prisons of Dublin?—A Mr. Reed has been lately appointed.

Can you state whether that gentleman discharges his duties in person in the prisons of Dublin?—He does; but the late surgeon did not, by whose resignation he has been appointed.

In what manner did the late surgeon perform his duty?—By deputy.

At what time did the resignation of the late surgeon take place; was it since your appointment to office?—Certainly.

Did you receive any report, through the local inspector, of the performance of those duties by the surgeon of the prison by deputy, and not in person?—I did not, but I knew it at once; there was no occasion for a report, as it was quite evident.

Is there an attendance book kept in the prisons under the Act?—Yes, there is.

Major James Palmer. (27 May)

Does not the law require, that the officers should not only enter in that book their names and the periods of their visits, but the duties which they perform?—The Act of last session does require it.

Is there any entry made of the duties performed, by the officers, in that book?—There is, sometimes; we have had frequent occasions to call the attention of the officers of Dublin to that circumstance, so much so, that upon my last inspection, I called upon the inspector to report to me, whether the officers did, *bonâ fide*, attend, as I saw some omissions, and I required in writing from him, a written statement that they did so, which I received; this I thought necessary previous to my making my report to Parliament, that I might have grounds for reporting that the duty was performed, when by the book it appeared, in some instances, it was not; by the signature book I mean.

In adopting the form of report, which you and Major Woodward have perused, you have abstracted under separate heads; have you not the different provisions of the Gaol Act, in the shape of queries to the officers?—That was our plan; as we had no general direction, we proposed it to ourselves as the best mode of obtaining information as to every clause of the Act of Parliament.

And in the conclusion of your report, you give your view of the summary of the whole of the queries?—We do.

Are you aware how those special queries, with reference to the medical department of the Dublin prisons, are answered on the face of your report?—I do not recollect the particulars, but the general impression on my mind is, and I am ready now to bear testimony to it, that the medical men belonging to the gaols of Dublin do attend, and that the duty, so far as the present system is capable of, is performed, that is, the sick are attended to virtually, though the medical officers may not have always entered their names in the book.

Your general recommendation, which you have alluded to in the former part of your evidence, with regard to improvement, bears solely on this plan of an united hospital for all the gaols?—It bears solely upon a plan of economy, superior accommodation, and a better provision for attention to the sick, without any reference whatever intended as to the performance or non-performance of the medical attendance.

Ireland is divided into divisions for the purpose of inspection?—It is.

Each inspector has his own division?—That is what we consider as our duty.

Each reports on his own division?—Yes; with the exception that I made in the commencement of my evidence, for reasons that appear to be advantageous with respect to Dublin.

On your distinct inspection, you each form your opinion on your own individual observations?—Yes.

What is the division that has taken place in Ireland, which you inspect, into provinces?—They were not divided into provinces; but north and south.

Do you inspect north, or south?—North.

How long have you been in your office?—A year and four months.

Have the goodness to inform the Committee whether it be possible for all the officers to attend at the same hour, without giving the keeper of the prison such notice as would enable him to be prepared for them?—I think not for the purposes of their various duties.

In point of fact, if different officers were to attend together, simultaneously, must it not be the result of a previous appointment for that purpose?—Certainly.

If therefore, the apothecary and the physician were obliged to attend together, could that be effected without some previous arrangement between the two persons to meet at the same hour?—Certainly not.

Are you aware of any actual inconvenience that has arisen from the apothecary not in person attending the physician when he goes to the gaol?—No, I am not.

Do not you think it would be better for those officers to attend separately, without any previous notice to the gaoler, or to persons connected with the governor of the gaol?—Not the apothecary.

Is it better that they should attend at one hour, or not?—The apothecary has no duty to perform as a gaol officer, he is only to obey the directions of the medical man; he is different from all other officers, the Act calls on him to attend with the surgeon, that he may receive his instructions, what he is to do.

Would it not be a better check on the officers residing in the prison, to be subject to visits from these persons at different hours, and unprepared, than if both

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

came at a certain hour, on a stipulated day?—I think it would, from all the practical officers of the gaol.

Then, in point of fact, though their not attending together may be departing from the strict letter of the Act, you do not conceive any public inconvenience to have arisen from it?—I presume not, as the medical officers do not consider the attendance of the apothecary of the Dublin prisons necessary or useful.

Do you think that the practice of allowing officers of a prison, from any view of expediency, to depart from the letter of the law, is not in itself a greater inconvenience and mischief than the possible benefit which may be derived from such a practice?—I think so, as a general principle.

Will you inform the Committee if you consider your own departure from the strict letter of the Act of Parliament has produced more inconvenience to the public than the convenience which you promise to yourself from that departure?—I think that our having the approbation of the government makes it an exception; I would add that the head of a department in making an arrangement for its better regulation, which required many alterations, might call for a departure from the strict letter of the law, which would not be justifiable in the minor officers of that department.

Is the Committee to understand that you think the head of a department should have a discretion to disobey an Act of Parliament, which discretion ought not to be entrusted to an inferior officer?—Certainly; I do not consider that the head of a department should have discretion to disobey an Act of Parliament, but circumstances might arise, when he might do it for the good of the public, with the consent of government.

If, therefore, the head of a medical department suggested that it would be better for an apothecary to attend at different hours, would it not be well that the Act should be so altered as to give him that power?—I think so; but in this case the apothecary does not attend at any hours; I am very incapable of answering on such a subject, more than a mere opinion, but I have no objection to give this answer.

You stated that the prisoners and the debtors in Newgate were not kept distinct; are you aware of the construction of Newgate?—I am.

With the prison in its present state, is such a division or classification practicable?—I think it is, because that department where there are a few rooms, is specially laid out for debtors.

Do you mean that there is one side for debtors exclusively?—One corner of the prison is allotted for debtors.

Are debtors at present removed from Newgate entirely?—I think they are, by a proclamation from the privy council, under the authority of the last Act of Parliament.

Then, now the mixture of debtors and prisoners is impossible in Newgate?—Certainly.

Are you aware how many yards there are in Newgate?—I am, but my recollection would not serve me precisely; [*a plan of the gaol of Newgate handed to the witness*] there are five.

Do you happen to know how many of those yards are appropriated to females?—Only one.

Do you know the dimensions of that yard?—It is a small yard.

In point of fact, is it possible to effect a complete classification of the prisoners in the gaol of Newgate, unless there be a new Newgate, or such alterations as are quite inconsistent with the limits of the present prison?—Quite impracticable; nor is the present Newgate capable of additions, for want of ground.

Have you any hesitation in stating your opinion to be, that a new Newgate is necessary in Dublin, for the purposes of prison discipline?—I have always thought so since I possessed my present appointment.

Are you aware that the neglect of the late surgeon in the prisons of Dublin, was made the subject of repeated reports by the inspector to the grand jury?—I do not recollect it, it was probably previous to my appointment.

Do you believe that he has done so?—I never heard it, but think it probable he did so.

Are you aware that the late surgeon was more than once fined by the grand jury for neglect of his duty?—I am not aware of it, it is possible.

Have you heard that he was actually removed by the grand jury for neglect of duty, and

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

and re-instated by the court, inasmuch as the grand jury had no authority to supersede him?—I think I have heard of such a circumstance.

Do you believe that the grand jury acted on the report of the inspector in imposing those fines?—I have not heard before of the circumstances.

Are you aware of any other way in which the grand jury could have been apprized of neglect of duty, but through the report of the inspector?—No other way except the late inspector-general might have done it; but those things are all previous to my time.

You have heard that he did make reports of the neglect of the surgeon?—No, I did not hear it.

Have you heard that the late surgeon was actually removed for neglect?—Yes, I have heard it.

And that he was re-instated by the judges of the court of King's Bench, from a want of authority in the grand jury to remove him?—I do not recollect the particulars, as it was previous to my time, but such a circumstance as is now mentioned I have heard, that there was an interference on the part of the grand jury as to his constant non-attendance.

You have stated an alteration as to a general hospital for the prisons of all Dublin; do you mean to apply it to those that are confined for debt as well as those who are confined for criminal charges?—No.

Then you mean to exclude debtors from that general hospital?—I did; from the difficulty that would arise with respect to the security to the gaoler for their debts.

Do you mean to exclude debtors from that arrangement?—I do.

How would you propose the sick in the debtors prisons should be attended to?—The debtors are provided with superior accommodation, very often they have rooms to themselves, and I would propose that they should be attended as any sick man would be in his own room.

Should they leave their own hospital and go to attend the debtors in prison?—Clearly so, inasmuch as they could easier do it, than a medical man now go round to all the prisons.

If a sick debtor be seen beyond the precincts of the prison, would not the sheriff be liable to pay the whole of his debt?—I believe he would; but my opinion is, that the plan of acting on this principle is not applicable to debtors; and I never intended to include them.

The general Penitentiary is not included in it?—No.

You have inspected that prison more than once?—I have.

Were you satisfied with the arrangements of that prison, and its interior economy?—Certainly not.

Are you aware what has been the expense of the medical department last year in the Dublin prisons, in all of the five Dublin prisons?—I think something less than 2,000 *l.*

Expenses, and salaries, and medicines?—I think I have exceeded it when I say 2,000 *l.*

The Committee understand you mean to give us a return of what the savings would probably be in your plan?—Certainly; but more than economy was our object.

You have stated, a young practitioner would be preferable; do not you think an experienced one would be better, if not encumbered with too much business?—I do; but I think he would not consent to reside there; and I consider residence necessary on account of night and evening attendance.

But it is not necessary for debtors?—It would be equally necessary, but that is a difficulty I have met with, and should not prevent the execution of the plan.

You mentioned Madam Stephens' hospital; can you tell what the expenses of the medical establishment of that hospital are?—I cannot at present recollect.

Do you know what the salary of the apothecary is, independent of the medicines?—I think his salary is about 40 *l.* or 50 *l.* a year.

Who is the resident apothecary?—I do not know his name.

Is not Dr. Cowen the resident medical man at Madam Stephens' hospital?—I never heard of him.

With respect to Madam Stephens' hospital, you do not know what the expenses of that officer is?—No.

What is his accommodation?—He has rooms.

Major James Palmer.

27 May.)

You do not know what the expenses of the medical establishment of Madam Stephens' are?—I do not recollect.

The Madam Stephens' hospital must be thrown out of the comparison with Newgate?—With this difference, that purchasing their own medicines and compounding them themselves, there must be a very great saving in place of a bill coming from an apothecary.

Have there been any late alterations in the way of buildings or architectural changes in the Dublin prisons, since you have been acquainted with them?—There have been additional cells erected in Richmond bridewell, but I am not aware of any material alteration except that.

Are you enabled to state to the Committee, whether those alterations have been carried on an economical principle, or whether they have led to any unnecessary expense?—I am quite unprepared to answer that, inasmuch as I really do not know who is the contractor, or what were the specifications and agreement.

Do you know how many cells there are in Newgate at this moment [*a plan handed to witness*]?—This is accurate, I have no doubt.

Are there thirty-six?—Yes.

Do you know whether there have been since the passing of the Act against fees, any fees charged or received, whether as fees, or in the shape of rents, in the Dublin prisons?—There have been; but Major Woodward and I conceived it right, in consequence of that, to represent it to the court of King's Bench; and within the last two months, the judges of the King's Bench called the governors of the gaols, who had continued the practice before them, and directed them to do so no more, having considered that the abolition of fees extended even to the rents of rooms.

Did the gaolers take it as rents or as fees?—They do not consider them as fees, we did consider them so, and submitted it for the decision of the court of King's Bench; but in consequence of the gaoler of the sheriff's prison having no salary, but the rents of the rooms, the judges made no order on the subject in that prison, until they had considered further what remedy could be had.

The order of the judges has been absolute with regard to the other prisons?—Certainly.

Has it been complied with?—I have no reason to doubt it.

Had you at any time remonstrated with the governors of the several prisons, against charging rents prior to this application to the court?—Certainly, we did; but we were not clear ourselves that the abolition of fees extended to the rent of rooms, till we applied to the court of King's Bench.

Having mentioned the sheriff's prison, will you inform the Committee as to the state of that prison; are you acquainted with it?—Yes, perfectly.

State what is its condition?—The situation of the sheriff's prison has been considerably improved since the appointment of Mr. Wood as governor or keeper, both in cleanliness and order.

Do you think in any new arrangement of the Dublin prisons, the sheriff's prison would be united with any other, or any other alteration made, which would lead to a better arrangement for the public?—Major Woodward and I were clearly of opinion, that if all the debtors could be congregated together in the marshalsea of the four courts, so as to be in one prison, that considerable economy and good order might be the result.

Do not you think it a bad principle to allow insolvents to be remanded back to prison where common debtors reside, those insolvents who are remanded for fraud?—Yes, I do.

You state that there has been a geat improvement since Mr. Wood has been appointed governor, are you aware what the emolument of Mr. Wood is, as keeper of the sheriff's prison?—I believe his emoluments by the abolition of the rent of rooms and fees, if put in force in that prison, would leave him nothing; if the law is put in force he will have nothing.

Would he not have certain expenses, and be out of pocket if the rent of rooms and fees being abolished were rigorously enforced in that prison; would he not be at the expense of white washing without a farthing remuneration?—He would be a loser.

Are you aware that the sheriff's prison is repaired by the grand jury presentment?—Since the Act of the last session, the grand jury have often allowed diet to the pauper debtors at our suggestion; but how the prison was repaired previous to that, I know not.

Major James Palmer.
(27 May.)

Do you not think that this arrangement would be satisfactory to the public in general; namely, that the grand jury should allow a certain salary to the keeper, and that the rents which he at present receives for rooms, and that the fees should go so far *pro tanto* towards the repairs of the prison, supposing fees to exist?—Certainly, my own opinion goes against allowing any rents of rooms to be paid.

On the supposition that fees are to continue, do not you think that arrangement would be satisfactory to the public?—I do.

Would you recommend the abolition of fees and rent in all prisons, where there are debtors of all kinds, namely, rich and poor were confined?—I would, provided there was a classification of them.

What classification would you have for debtors?—The poor from the rich, and the riotous and disorderly from the peaceably disposed.

Can you give any satisfactory reason why a man of substance who chose to remain in prison for debt, should not pay for his lodging; or does not a very different reason apply to that man, from that which applies to a poor man, who is necessarily confined for debt, who is without the means of paying rent?—I think a man who pays for lodging becomes less a subject of discipline, which is necessary in all gaols; I think discipline is increased by not allowing any man privileges in proportion to his means.

Do not you think it is possible to save the public the expense of some, by subjecting those who have the means, to pay a rent for their lodgings?—I think it would be a principle of justice to the public, but at the same time I think it would be injurious to the well being of the gaol, so far as the public are willing to sacrifice the discipline of the gaol to the benefit of receiving that help towards the support of the gaol, of course you must take the evil with it.

What reason can you give for assuming that such wealthy prisoners who can afford to pay for rent, are not as amenable to the regulations of the gaol as a poor prisoner; what valid reason is there for excluding the one from the general regulations of the prison?—I think a man naturally claims a privilege in consequence of his paying for a thing, which he would not do if that thing was given to him according to his good conduct, under the regulations of a good governor to a gaol; and in point of fact, it has been practised within the last three months, at Kilmainham gaol, where debtors are confined; for in consequence of the last Act of Parliament, the court of King's Bench did order the gaoler to charge no longer for the rent of rooms, and so far from an evil, I rather think that there is better order established there.

Do not you think as much injury arises to the general morality of prisoners under each circumstances, from enabling them to live rent free in a place which they select for their residence, as would arise to the discipline of the prison from exempting them from just payments?—I do not think so, and my reason is this, that where the gaoler receives payment for certain accommodation from the debtor, I think he is unavoidably influenced to grant indulgencies to that debtor, for his prompt and ready payment, which he would have no motive for giving to the debtor who paid him nothing.

Will that answer apply under the proposed regulation of rents, which should be applied not to the use of the gaoler, but to the general service of the public?—I think it would considerably lessen the difficulties.

Would it not entirely remove them?—I think it would not entirely remove them, inasmuch as I think payment naturally gives to the person an idea that he has a claim to something that the poorer debtor has not a claim to.

Is not that a principal recognized in all gaols for the confinement of debtors?—It has been hitherto, but I think it has been most mischievous.

Is there not a distinction between prisoners who have money and those who have not?—I think that distinction would rest in the breast of the local inspector and the keeper, the debtor being liable to removal, in case of misconduct, to worse apartments.

Would you leave it in the breast of a local inspector, whether a man, who could afford himself a dinner of the best description, with wines of the best description, should have that dinner or not, if he can afford it, if he is only confined for debt?—Certainly not.

The Committee want to know, whether there is any reasonable objection to making those wealthy debtors contribute to the expense of lodging, the gaoler having no interest whatever in the money which is received?—I apprehend not much, upon consideration; but discipline would, in a slight degree, be injured by payment.

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

Do you not think that the prohibition of fees altogether, as it now stands by the statute law of the country, is one which protects the public from the misconduct likely to arise from allowing certain fees, and leaving a discretion with regard to those fees any where and to any body?—I think so.

Is there any superintending committee appointed for the management of the Dublin prisoners, or any of them; we will say for Newgate?—No; if there is any appointed it has a local character under the Act; I think the Act excepts the city and county of Dublin.

Do you not conceive that exception is destructive to the internal discipline, and the proper regulation of the prisoners of Dublin?—I do.

Is there any reason which could induce Parliament to recommend the establishment of superintending committees elsewhere, that do not apply, in your judgment, to the prisons in Dublin?—None; I am not aware of what could have been the cause of making them an exception.

Do you think the appointment of superintending committees, in the Dublin prisons, would be productive of advantage?—I think it would if other persons were added, as in the country gaols, to the committee besides grand jurors; not excluding the grand jurors.

Why do you think the addition of other persons, besides grand jurors, would be advantageous in the appointment of superintending committees?—Because in that case the persons chosen would be such as could give their time to the business, and who were disposed to go there.

From your acquaintance with prison matters in Dublin, do you think any difficulty, in procuring the attendance of benevolent persons, would be found for the superintending committees?—There would be no difficulty; but I should be disposed to recommend, if such a plan was adopted, that the magistrates of the head police offices should be upon that committee.

As ex-officio members?—Yes, I think so.

Do you conceive the superintendence of the contract system of supply by such committees, appointed under the authority of the grand jurors, would produce an improved system in the Dublin prisons?—I think it would.

Are you aware of the present mode of supplying the prisoners by contract?—I am.

Explain it to the Committee?—The grand jury advertises for contracts immediately previous to the assizes, and they decide upon such contracts during the few days they sit.

Are you aware that they advertise for contracts for almost every separate article necessary for prisons, such as blankets, ticking, flour, soap, bread, all separately; are you aware of that being the practice?—I think it amounts to being separately, but they are all mentioned in one advertisement, and certain things are put together under one head; it is the practice for a man to put in a contract for more than one article.

Are you aware of the mode practised by the grand jury in the city of Dublin in accepting these tenders?—I have always understood they take the lowest, if security is given.

Are they obliged by law to take the lowest?—I am not aware of it.

Have you ever heard of instances of complaint, that undue favour has been shown by the members of the grand jury to certain of their own dependents, and that they have not selected the lowest tender?—I have heard it as a constant commentary of the citizens of Dublin, that the general feeling is, that favour is shown; but I am not aware of any instance myself of such a thing.

Are you aware, that, if such is the general opinion, that any one person contributing his share to the taxation of the city, may appear in court and ask the judge to examine the different contracts that have been sent to the grand jury?—No, I am not aware of it; I never heard of it.

If the witness is informed that such is the law, does it not appear to him that the general complaints of the citizens of Dublin are rather unfounded, having the means of redress in their own hands?—I do imagine that there may be circumstances connected with contracts that would make it almost impossible to correct the error, if there be any, except by either having it under the government or under a committee, who had the means of prompt payment.

If the law obliges the grand jury to select the lowest tender for supplying any article by contract; and if any individual supposes that the grand jury has not chosen

Major James Palmer.

(27 May.)

chosen that lowest tender; if that individual has the power of going into court, and to hear the different contracts read over to him, supposing he has offered to be a contractor, has he not the power of judging fairly and openly in court, whether his own offer was the lowest or not?—I think so; but that is not the circumstance I allude to.

If such is the case, and if there is no instance of having recourse to such redress, does it not naturally appear, that there is no instance whatever of undue preference?—I think it would appear so; I certainly could prove no abuse; and if it exists, it may be amongst contractors themselves, and be beyond the control of the grand jury.

Will you state any probable circumstances that you think might interfere?—The circumstance that I would suppose might interfere, is this; in a large city, where the citizens have so constantly complained of unfair dealings with respect to the contracts, it might arise from this, that certain persons will not come forward to offer for contracts, from a wish not to interfere with other contractors who have generally had the contract; that there is not that competition, though it is fully left open by the advertisements.

Is that the usual course of business in a large commercial town like Dublin; must there not be many thousand persons anxious to get a trifling profit from a contract with a public body, where payment is certain?—I do not mean to say, that it is the case; I only state, I can suppose that there is not a fair competition for it, inasmuch as a person who might desire that profit, would not come forward, as it would be an interference with persons who generally possess that contract.

Will the witness assent to this proposition, that one fact is worth a thousand, complaints?—I think so; for any thing I know it may be a most unjust accusation.

Is it not fair to presume that if persons have heard a thousand complaints of abuse in supplying the prisons by contract, and they have not been favourable to one single fact; is it not fair to presume that the complaints on that subject are rather unjust?—I think so.

Would it not appear, if the contracts had very generally gone to an individual connected in some way with the grand jury, would you not conclude that there had been some share of partiality with regard to such individual, which would create some suspicion in the minds of the citizens?—I think so; if it appeared that a relation of a grand juror generally got the contract, it would give cause for suspicion.

But that might be unfounded?—It might.

Do you think, from your acquaintance with the prisons throughout Ireland, that the contract system can ever be administered with entire prudence or economy by a body who only act in a hurried manner like the grand jury, encumbered with criminal business?—I think it does create considerable difficulty in all parts of Ireland.

Have you any hesitation or doubt in affirming whether, if there was a superintending committee appointed for a prison, receiving proposals openly and deciding upon the lowest bidder, and the most solvent security that a contract system might not be introduced of more economy to the public than can be administered through the medium of any grand jury?—I do think so; a considerable advantage would arise, not only to the country but to Dublin, by a committee of that nature, if well chosen; they would have the entire six months between each assizes or term, not only to propose contracts, but to make such alterations as they might recommend to be laid before the grand jury for approval; the contracts are at present for half a year, so that the intermediate grand jury of Dublin could not alter them in any way whatever.

Can you suggest any improvement in the system of contracts?—I would suggest, with respect to Dublin, that the head police magistrates, who are officers of the crown, should, with the grand jury committee, receive and approve of all contracts for food, necessaries and buildings, previous to being sent to the grand jury to be passed.

Mercurii, 28° die Maii, 1823.

RICHARD WOGAN TALBOT, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Alexander Tulloch, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Alexander Tulloch. (28 May.)

DO you hold any situation in the city of London or Westminster?—I am one of the principal coal meters in the city and liberty of Westminster.

From that situation you have opportunities of being acquainted with the details of the coal trade in London?—I think I have.

Can you inform the Committee the rate of metage that is charged upon coals brought into the port of London?—I cannot inform the Committee of that, it rests entirely with the city of London; the rate of metage within the port of London rests with the corporation of London.

Do you happen, from your own knowledge, to know any thing about it?—No; the amount of it depends upon the quantity imported.

What is the rate per chaldron?—The coal metage of the city of London is 8*d.* per chaldron in the pool, and the average importation is about 1,200,000 chaldrons.

Are the coals measured before they are landed, or on landing from the vessel?—They are measured from the ship into the barges that are brought up at the different wharfs on each side the river, and then measured out by land metage by the bushel; the measure used in the pool and on board the ship is the vat.

Then they pay 8*d.* per chaldron in the pool?—Yes.

What do they pay the land meters?—Sixpence per chaldron.

That is the case equally in London and Westminster?—In any part of the river.

To whom are those fees payable?—At the meters office; there is an office in the city of London, there is an office in the city and liberty of Westminster, there is one also in Surrey, and another in Middlesex, at all those they pay sixpence per chaldron to the meters.

Is there any other measuring that takes place, except those two?—No one.

Then in point of fact, every chaldron of coals that comes into the port of London, pays fourteen-pence meter's fees?—Yes.

Every chaldron pays eightpence in the pool, and sixpence land metage?—Yes.

Does the whole of that or any portion of it go to the coal meters themselves?—In the city of London the eightpence per chaldron is due to the government, it is the revenue of the lord mayor; but the land metage of sixpence per chaldron goes to pay the wages of the meters; the eightpence per chaldron in the pool, is a distinct fund altogether.

Then in point of fact, of the 14*d.* eightpence is the profit of the city of London, and sixpence is the remuneration of the coal meters?—Yes.

How are coals measured to the consumers in the city of London and Westminster?—By the chaldron or by the score.

Is it by weight or capacity?—By measure, there is a certain description of coals which are weighed; but there is a very large sort of coal comes to market here, it is generally burned in the House of Lords, there are perhaps not more than from twenty to thirty tons delivered in my district.

There is no slate in that?—Very little.

Can you form an opinion as to which mode of delivering coals you would give the preference to, by weight or by measure?—It is impossible to deliver the Newcastle coals and the sea coals by weight, it would occupy so much time.

Independently of the waste of time, which mode would afford the greatest facility for fraud?—I should think measurement secures the property to the consumer in every respect; and the mode that we have now adopted, not only secures the quantity, but the quality likewise, there is a diversity of quality; there are, perhaps, about from sixty to seventy or a hundred different sorts; we have tickets at the river that describe the different sorts; there are nine sorts of coals that are allowed to be mixed, there is a quantity of inferior coals that would be attempted to be mixed if we did not use this precaution.

You think it part of your duty as coal meter, to see that the coals are of that description of coals that they purport to be?—Certainly.

Mr. Alexander Tulloch

28 May.

Do you think that if a mode of delivering them by weight were adopted, it would or would not open a door to great frauds?—I should think it would.

Independently of mixing the coals by using means to increase the weight?—Yes.

Then on the whole, are the Committee to understand your opinion decidedly to be, that selling coals by measure is the most advantageous to the consumer?—Yes; provided that the meter be honest, it depends upon that.

Have the corporation of the city of London exercised the right of raising the fees for metage?—No; there has been no alteration in the expense of metage, since the Act of the 47th of the late King; I think it was in the year 1806, previous to that Act there was only 4*d.* per chaldron.

Then it was raised from 4*d.* to 6*d.*?—Yes.

By what authority is the 8*d.* payable in the pool levied?—By authority of the lord mayor of London.

By what authority, or what Act was the 8*d.* per chaldron charged for measuring in the pool?—I am not aware of any other authority except that; the Parliament gave that privilege to the city of London.

When was that?—I do not know.

Was it before the 47th of the late King?—Certainly.

Does the Act recite any reason for raising the meters from 4*d.* to 6*d.*?—The difference of the times, the inducement was that better men might be employed and the times are more expensive.

Therefore the Committee may conclude your opinion to be, that the increase of expense is more than balanced by the superior respectability of the persons now employed than formerly?—Certainly; I can speak of my own knowledge.

It is a situation of considerable trust?—It certainly is.

A person if he were disposed to be dishonest would have considerable opportunities?—Certainly.

It is therefore of importance that the officers should be paid so as to induce persons of a superior description to accept of it?—Certainly; I take a great deal of pains in making a selection of men who possess good characters, they have served as non-commissioned officers in the army, and they retire with pensions, which makes them independent, and above committing any fraud; there is a variety of difference in weight and quality, and advantage accrues to the public by prefering measure to weight, because a chaldron of good coals weighs perhaps about twenty-five hundred; a chaldron of a light quality of coals would weigh but eighteen hundred.

But if the coals be very slatey and exposed to weather, will not in that point of view the worst coals weigh heaviest?—It will increase their weight, certainly.

Who are the meters appointed by?—The principal Westminster meters are appointed by the Treasury, by patent; the coal meters in the city of London are appointed by the corporation, and the labouring meters of Westminster are appointed by myself.

What is your custom in appointing those meters?—We make generally the best selection that we can possibly have; we select non-commissioned officers, who have served in the army, who are discharged with an allowance of one shilling, or half a crown per day, and they give security for their good conduct, or some person for them, in order that they may be a class of men to be above the inducement of receiving bribes or acceding to any frauds.

They pay nothing for their situation?—No.

They give security?—They do; the security is nominal; in fact, they are not entrusted with any sum of money received in the course of the week for whatever business they do, they retain their own 20*s.* and pay any surplus into the office.

The rest goes to the expense of the office, and the principal meters?—Yes.

Then the men are not paid by the chaldron?—No.

The money is collected by them on the chaldron?—Yes; they receive their wages on Saturday night.

The men are sworn?—They are.

Are they freemen of the city?—No; the principal number in the city of London are freemen of the city of London, because the corporation is obliged to provide somehow or other for their freemen, and sometimes they are not the best men to be employed, but we make a selection of the description of men I have mentioned.

Freemen are not preferred?—No.

You

Mr. Alexander Tulloch.

(28 May.)

You mean to say, that in the city of London, freemen would be preferred, but not in the city of Westminster?—They are generally preferred by the corporation, because they are obliged to provide for their freemen.

The same principle exists in the city of London as in Westminster, as to the quality of the men and the security?—I cannot speak as to that; I do not think they take any security in the city of London; I am talking of my own district.

What is the duty upon any quantity less than a chaldron?—There is no less quantity than a chaldron.

Is there no less quantity sold?—Yes, there are three sacks.

What is the duty paid upon that?—Three half-pence.

So that invariably they are sold by measure and pay accordingly, and by weight only in the instance of this large description of coal you have mentioned?—Yes; in my district I suppose there are not more than twenty-two tons in a year of that coal.

Do you find that many complaints have been made of your meters?—I cannot say that I do, considering the number of men that we employ, I think the number of complaints have been very few.

How many are they?—Forty-eight stations and two inspectors, two extra meters, and three assistant meters, so that in fact we have fifty-three meters employed in Westminster.

Can you tell the number employed in London?—That I cannot tell.

Have they as many as that?—They ought to have as many as that.

In case any frauds are committed by those meters, to whom do the parties apply?—To the magistrates; they impose a penalty upon parties connected with the meters in making that fraud.

Who can dismiss them?—I can dismiss them instantly, on any complaint against them of improper conduct.

John Claudius Beresford, Esq. an Alderman of the City of Dublin, called in; and Examined.

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

DO you know any thing of the debt stated to be due by the corporation of Dublin to the paving board?—Yes.

What debt is alleged to be due by the corporation of Dublin to the paving board?—It is alleged that the corporation owe the paving board between three and four years arrears, of the sum of 2,200 *l.* a year, which is payable by the corporation of Dublin to the paving board, for cleansing and paving the city of Dublin, under the provisions of an Irish Act of Parliament, passed in the 26th of George 3d, chapter 61, section 44, which is in the following words; " And whereas the cleansing of the " streets and other places in the city of Dublin, hath before the passing of the Act " of the 23d and 24th years of his present Majesty, been conducted and managed " under the direction of the lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said " city; and the expense thereof hath been defrayed by them out of the revenue arising by the tolls and customs of the said city, wherefore and towards enabling the " said directors and commissioners to defray the expense of cleansing the streets " of the city of Dublin; be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that the lord " mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city shall from and after the passing of this Act, continue to pay to the said directors and commissioners, the annual " sum of 2,000 *l.* out of the revenue of the said city, by equal half yearly payments " on every 29th day of September and 25th day of March in each and every " year, the first payment whereof shall be made on the first of the said dates ensuing the passing this Act; and the said directors and commissioners shall and " may have the same power of demanding, levying and recovering the same, as are " hereby given them for recovering of any of the rates and assessments which shall " or may be made under the authority of this Act."

Is it payable out of any particular funds?—In the year 1778, a committee sat in the Irish House of Commons, of which the present Lord Oriel, then Mr. Forster, was chairman, to inquire into the paving and scavenging of the city of Dublin, by whom and out of what funds it was done, with a view to establish a separate board to carry on those works in future, it appeared then, by the evidence of Alderman Gale, the treasurer of the corporation of the city of Dublin, that the corporation had been in the habit, for many years, of scavenging certain parts of the city of Dublin, and repairing the pavement of the parts leading to the markets, which service

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

service was considered by him, as he stated in his evidence, to have been done under the directions of the charter by which we enjoy the tolls and customs of the city of Dublin; and it appeared, upon the average of a certain number of years, the expense of that came to a sum of something between two thousand and two thousand one hundred pounds; the committee then reported, that they considered that the corporation ought to be relieved from that duty upon paying the paving board, that was then to be established, the annual sum of 2,200*l.* a year, and accordingly an Act of Parliament passed, in a subsequent session, grounded upon that report, that service was taken off the city of Dublin, and from that time forth they continued to pay, out of the tolls and customs as was directed by the Act, the sum of 2,200*l.* a year. Some years ago, about the year 1815 or 1816, some men, mostly attornies in the city of Dublin, took upon them to go to the different toll-houses and urge the country people not to pay the tolls, stating that they were illegal, and tendered themselves to carry on suits against; the consequence of which was, that several suits were instituted against the corporation. A man, signing by some feigned signature, published letters in the newspaper, advising the country people to resist the payment of the tolls by force, and a resistance took place in consequence of his letters and interference, and the corporation were unable to collect those tolls; they then refused to pay the paving board, as the funds out of which the payment was to be made were no longer productive, and the arrear was thereby incurred.

Is the Committee to understand from you, that the legal and only fund from which you might be called upon to pay that 2,200*l.* a year to the paving board, was to be found in the proceeds of the tolls and customs?—Certainly, the Act recites it.

How many years is it since the corporation of Dublin has been deprived of the means arising out of that fund?—They were partially deprived of it between seven and eight years ago, as appeared by the event of a suit in which there was a verdict against the corporation for money that appeared to have been collected during the year, which I think was 1,700*l.*; the paving board sued the corporation for the money.

They sued you for the arrear of 2,200*l.*?—They did; and we pleaded that we had only so much in our hands, arising out of the tolls.

They got a verdict for that sum?—They got a verdict for that sum in our hands, and no more.

They got the exact balance arising out of the collection of the tolls in your hands?—The sum collected from the tolls since the last payment made to them in full.

Under what authority was it that the corporation of Dublin was obliged to provide for the paving and scavenging of the city of Dublin?—The charter of the 28th of Charles the Second.

Besides the scavenging and paving of the city of Dublin, were there any other duties directed to be performed by the corporation of Dublin out of the proceeds of the tolls and customs?—Yes, others; very considerable.

Will you mention the first of those duties that occurs to your mind; the public works that they were bound to execute out of the proceeds of those tolls and customs?—The charter directs, that the entire proceeds should be expended, for the first seven years, in such way as the King shall point out; after that, it orders us to provide for the different works appointed, one was the building of the Tholsel.

What is that for?—It was for a town-house and courts of law; another object was for the Blue school, the market-house, and corn market, in Thomas-street, were then ordered under it.

What is the market-house, in Thomas-street, used for?—It was used as a corn market; another object was, establishing the market in Smithfield.

Any thing else?—Making quays, and roads, and streets, leading up to the market in Smithfield; building bridges across the river Liffey, the Red Mills River, leading to Smithfield.

What bridges?—One was a wooden bridge, across the Red Mills River.

Was the Tholsel built by the corporation?—It was.

Was the Blue school also built by the corporation?—I mean the old school, it was built at that time.

Was the market-house and corn market, in Thomas-street?—It was.

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

Is not Smithfield a broad street, where the hay and straw is sold in Dublin?—It is, and cattle.

Was there any expense gone to by the corporation of Dublin, in providing Smithfield as a hay and straw market?—Yes; the corporation made a lease to a man of the name of Henry Ellis, of a very large and valuable tract of ground, for 200 years, on the condition that he should purchase up another lease that was held by an individual who had a time to run of it, of part of the ground on which Smithfield market now stands; that he should open and prepare that market, and pave it for a public market, and build the quays, bridges, and so forth, leading to it.

Did they in consequence of that, make purchases to a considerable expense, or not, in order to enlarge Smithfield?—The property which has now descended to Lord Clifden from Mr. Ellis, is worth eight or 10,000 *l.* a year.

Did the corporation go to any considerable expense, or not, in purchasing the property to clear away, so as to make the Smithfield?—They went to no expense; Mr. Ellis went to the expense, and they gave him a lease for a certain period as remuneration.

What is the term?—200 years; it will expire in 1876.

Did the corporation, in the peformance of the duties imposed on them by charter, build any bridges?—Not at that time; but they made a condition, that Mr. Ellis was to build two bridges, which he did in consequence of it, and made the quay.

Is the Committee then to understand, that Mr. Ellis, the lessee of the corporation of Dublin, did, in consequence of the beneficial lease made to him by the corporation, execute those duties for the corporation that they were bound by charter to execute?—He did all those which concerned the establishment of Smithfield-market.

So far as Smithfield is concerned?—Yes, it is so stated in the body of the lease.

Does the paving board continue to demand from the corporation of Dublin, this composition of 2,200 *l.* a year?—Yes, the paving board have filed a bill in chancery now.

Has the corporation of Dublin ever made any representation to the paving board, that the corporation are deprived of the source from whence that 2,200 *l.* a year was to be paid?—I went personally to the paving board, at the request of the corporation, to tell them they were unable collect the tolls to the full extent; that, if the paving commissioners would accept from them as much as they could collect to the extent of 2,200 *l.* or short of it, if they were not able collect so much, that they would endeavour to collect it for their use, and hand to them all they received, till it amounted to 2,200 *l.*; but they did not wish to receive it, if by receiving it they should subject themselves to the whole debt.

What answer did they give to that communication?—They told me, they would hold no communication with me on the subject.

Was there only one application made, or were there any further applications made?—They made applications to government on the subject.

Do you remember what reply government made?—The secretary for Ireland told us, that if we would bring the cause to issue, so as to establish our title, they would aid us in the collection of it; in consequence of that we made several seizures of corn, to see if by distress we could force a suit to try the right and make the other party plaintiffs in the cause.

Where did you make the seizures?—At the different toll-gates; we always took care to confine it within the city, so as not to make a seizure in the county.

What was the result of those proceedings?—The parties frequenting the market, when we attempted to make them plaintiffs, never brought an action, but they came and paid the tolls in a few days afterwards. Feeling ourselves unable to make the farmers frequenting the markets plaintiffs in the cause, we brought an action against some of them for defrauding us of the tolls; they suffered judgment to go against them by default; they never would come to a trial.

You have had judgment upon those actions brought by you?—Yes.

What was the amount that the corporation received for the tolls in any one year before these disputes arose?—In the year 1813, to the best of my recollection, they received 5,250 *l.*; and afterwards, when the peace came, they fell, and were set for 4,100 *l.*

Were you the tenant at 4,100 *l.*?—I was the tenant at 5,200 *l.*

Who were the former tenants?—For a good many years it was held by a man of the name of Clarke, a founder, in Smithfield or King-street.

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

What did he pay?—He paid about 500 *l.* or 800 *l.* less than I did.

Was it let by public advertisement?—Almost always by public advertisement and public bidding at auction; sometimes by sealed proposals.

What has the corporation received by way of income arising out of the tolls by lease, or otherwise, for the last three years?—Nothing.

Why have they received nothing?—They were unable to collect it.

On account of this opposition?—Yes.

Was not the paving board appointed to perform these duties for which the tolls were intended to pay?—Partially.

Notwithstanding the corporation have been, as you have described, so deprived of their income from tolls, are they not bound either to pay this 2,200 *l.* a year to the paving board for paving and scavenging, or to perform the duty of paving and scavenging?—We do not think they are, which is the reason we dispute it.

Then you mean to say that the corporation are not bound to do this duty of scavenging and paving?—I think they are not.

Then they have no duties of the kind to perform?—No.

Then the paving board have those duties to perform?—Yes.

Then to what purposes would you apply the produce of those tolls in case the corporation were to levy them?—We should put the exceedings of them into the general funds of the city, after paying the paving board 2,200 *l.* a year.

By what right?—The charter of King Charles.

Does the paving board discharge duties?—The part they perform is the paving and scavenging.

What are the other duties?—The other duties were, to make sundry buildings to a very large amount, and give ground to hold various markets, for which we have advanced sums of money and given leases as a remuneration, as I have already stated, the income of which at this moment would amount to a very large sum.

Would not the corporation be bound to continue to pay this 2,200 *l.* a year to the paving board, provided their income from the tolls and customs enabled them so to do?—Yes.

Do you consider that the corporation, if restored to their income arising out of the tolls and customs, would be bound to apply the proceeds of those tolls and customs for public works, for the benefit of Dublin?—No, I do not.

Why not?—Because they are bound no further than the commutation under the Act of Parliament of paving and scavenging.

Then you conceive that the only remaining duty to be performed by the corporation is the paving and scavenging?—Yes.

Does the paving board continue to perform the duty of paving and scavenging, notwithstanding they have not latterly received the amount of 2,200 *l.* a year from the corporation?—They do.

The paving board not receiving that amount from the corporation, from what fund do they scavenge and pave?—I understand that they say their funds are short of their duties, and that they are unable to carry it on for want of money.

Do you know what were their funds last year?—No, I do not.

From what funds do the paving board scavenge and pave?—From the taxes levied on the city of Dublin

You have already said, that if the corporation continue to receive their income from tolls, they would continue to pay this 2,200 *l.* a year to the paving board?—I have.

Is it not then a necessary consequence, that if the corporation continue to pay that 2,200 *l.* a year to the paving board, the taxation on the inhabitants of Dublin ought to be proportionably decreased?—Certainly.

Was the taxation of the city of Dublin less in the year the paving board received this 2,200 *l.* a year from the corporation than it is now?—It was not, but it ought to be.

Do you consider that the discontinuance of the payment of tolls and customs would be of such advantage to the community as that that sacrifice of the property of the corporation of Dublin ought to be endeavoured to be provided for?—I find it very hard to answer that question; the corporation would be glad to have the money and the payers would be glad not to pay it.

You have said that the corporation hold their tolls under charter?—Under the 28th of King Charles 2.

You have stated a variety of works that they are bound to perform; are those works completed?—All of them.

Did

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

Did not the legislature, when they compelled the corporation to pay certain sums for certain purposes, recognize that they held those tolls only in trust for the benefit of the citizens?—No, there was no such thing brought forward in the examination; the only evidence that was given, was by Alderman Gale, who stated, that out of a part of the tolls they used to do it.

You would not consider it right that the corporation should receive those tolls and apply them to their own purposes, or to any purposes but those?—I conceive that if the corporation pay the amount that the Parliament have imposed upon them to pay to the paving board, that according to all usage in such cases that they are entitled to the balance themselves.

If the works are completed, or if they are supplied from other sources, would you conceive that the tolls should continue to be levied?—I should conceive the tolls ought legally to be levied under the charter, subject to the charges that are put on them, and the balance should go to the corporation.

If the purposes for which they were intended are completed, to what purpose would you apply the produce of the tolls?—The charter of King Charles gives the tolls for the support of the magistracy, and the performance of works; therefore the balance should go to the support of the magistracy for the maintenance of the dignity; and the support of the magistracy is part of the purpose stated in the body of the charter; and in the original settings we used to make of the tolls a century ago, and in several settings, even down to about fifty years ago, we set the entire tolls to the city scavengers, for the performance of the duties of scavenging and the maintenance of the lord mayor's horses.

It was found equal to that?—It was; and the words were, and they paying the usual quantity of corn to the lord mayor; so that it has been considered this hundred years for the support of the dignity of the magistracy.

In what year was the attempt made to enforce the tolls?—We continued as long as we could, till forced to give them up from the opposition which commenced in the year 1813, and we continued to collect them for five or six years after that.

The tolls never were given up at any period?—No.

But the collection was obstructed in 1813?—Yes.

Then to what purposes have the whole of those tolls been appropriated since, and particularly that part which was to go to the paving board; to what purposes have they been appropriated since the establishment of the paving board?—From the time of the establishment of the paving board, we annually appropriated the sum of 2,200*l.* till the total stoppage of the tolls.

There has been a total stoppage of the tolls?—Yes.

That was in 1813?—It was begun at that time.

You have alluded to a lease made of Smithfield market, have you any objection to state the particulars of any other leases which have been made by the corporation of Dublin, that you are acquainted with?—The lease made by the corporation of Dublin to Henry Ellis, extended from the Park-gate to Lincoln-lane.

Who was this Mr. Henry Ellis, was he one of the corporation?—No; he was not.

How many years ago was that?—About a hundred and fifty years ago.

Will you state the particulars of any leases which have been recently made; the question refers to leases of lands?—I know none of markets; but with respect to lands, I took a lease myself the other day of part of the lands called Clonturk.

Have not they some rights of ferries?—Yes; I am a part holder of a ferry; I am not the lessee, but I am a partner.

You were lord mayor at one period?—I was.

Will you have the goodness to state the mode in which hay and straw are sold in Dublin?—By weight.

Will you state the particulars of the sale, the mode of weighing, and the amount paid?—Prior to the year that I was lord mayor, all hay came into the market on cars, containing four hundred and a quarter, there being an Act of Parliament that no car, coming into the market, should contain more or less than that quantity; but sometimes people were in the habit of putting on exactly what they call a double load, which sold as two loads: when I was lord mayor, I with the wish of many of the farmers, altered the plan, and set up weighing machines, which the farming society gave to the corporation; we had then each car weighed, its weight registered and a number given to it; they passed over the weigh bridges, and when weighed, the clerk tared them and gave them a ticket of the gross weight, the tare, and

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

and the net weight, and under that ticket they sold the hay, and that is the practice at present.

That was when you were lord mayor?—It was.

It was found beneficial?—It was.

How many weigh master's are there?—There was only one when I was lord mayor; I understand there are three now.

You do not know when the increase was made?—I do not know.

What was their salary?—They have no salary; I have been told that the office is worth between five and six hundred a year.

Among the three?—Yes.

Do they levy the tax on the farmer?—The scales by charter belong to the lord mayor, and he has a right to charge reasonable fees for weighing; the fee put upon the weighing by this machine, in my time, was a farthing on a hundred weight, making 2 *d.* a load, as well as I remember.

Then there was a charge put on at the time?—There was.

This was a charge laid on by direction of the lord mayor?—Yes.

What portion of this is paid to the lord mayor?—None; it all went to the clerk.

You have heard it was worth the sum you have mentioned, among the three?—Yes; between five and six hundred a year.

Do not you conceive it would be a great benefit, if hay was brought in in trusses, as it is in this country?—Certainly.

Is there any charge made in the hay market here?—I do not know.

Can you give any information as to the charges in the butter market?—They are regulated by Act of Parliament, and all the regulations of the butter market are by Act of Parliament.

Is the Act objectionable?—It is very objectionable.

What are the objections to it?—It is difficult to act under.

Do you mean to apply that to the general Butter Act, or the particular Butter Act for Dublin?—The general Butter Act, brought in by the Member for Waterford; there is no particular Butter Act for Dublin.

The charges are fixed, of course, in that Act?—They are.

Have you heard of any violation of the Act?—I have known of very great neglects, by weighing masters of the butter markets, and we had great trouble to bring them into order; and by some regulations I made, I raised the character of the brand, and since that, the butter market has generally been looked into, so as to raise its character very considerably.

What were the abuses which you endeavoured to correct?—Neglecting to examine the butter properly, and neglecting to stamp it at the period it was examined.

Stamping second rate, for best?—Certainly; and the officers who were intrusted to mark it, intrusting their porters to do it, in consequence of which, those officers, being corporators in the city of Dublin, in general, there was an inquiry made into it, and they broke them, and put in an Englishman, a stranger; on their dismissal there was a regular trial before the corporation on complaints made against them.

How many are there of those weigh masters?—In our jurisdiction there are two weigh masters to the export market, and there are two or three weigh masters of what we call open butter, which the housekeepers use.

Are there any provisions by law made with respect to the potatoe market?—I have heard of an Act of Parliament, but I cannot say that I ever read it, which exempts potatoes from market charges.

Is there such an Act in existence?—I have been told so.

They do pay charges?—They do.

Do you know of any abuses under this head?—Indeed I know of no abuses, except the violence and constant misconduct of a species of porters who call themselves factors, who are always contending with the lord mayor and the clerks of the market.

Are there no complaints?—None, except by the housekeepers and masters of those porters.

Where is the market?—Opposite Newgate.

Have the potatoes always paid?—They always paid factorage, they pay now a trifle of stallage.

Did they formerly pay stallage?—Not in the open streets.

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

When was that first imposed?—When I was lord mayor, we built the potatoe market, and laid on the stallage.

How much is that charge?—I believe a halfpenny a cent, it is either a halfpenny or a penny.

Then they are bound to sell in the market and no where else?—Yes.

It was not always so?—It was always so; except that it was in the open streets, and obstructed the ways.

There was no Act of Parliament for that?—No.

Do you know what are the sums collected from markets?—They are in the hands of different people, I have no idea; there was a root market built by an individual, I understand he receives sixpence a-day for every shed; it is private property, it was built by himself, but he could not use it except by licence from the lord mayor.

Who are the clerks of the market?—Three officers appointed by the lord mayor to assist in doing menial duties, such as the lord mayor cannot attend to, they receive different dues upon different things, for instance, I think they receive two shillings from every oyster boat coming in, and something from a potatoe boat; and I believe they now receive the stallage, which under the charter, the lord mayor is entitled to, but he does not take it.

Then all those charges seem to be laid on by the corporation?—By the lord mayor, under the power vested in him by charter.

Have the goodness to inform the Committee, whether you are aware of any tax levied on jaunting cars, and paid at the police establishment?—They pay for every number or licence as it is called.

How much?—I do not know.

It is on those who work for hire only?—Yes.

You have stated that legal proceedings were taken by the corporation of Dublin to ascertain their right to the tolls?—I have.

Have they succeeded in all or any of those proceedings so taken by them, to assert their rights?—Whenever they have taken proceedings, they have succeeded.

They have had judgment on all the proceedings taken by them?—Yes.

And notwithstanding that, they have been prevented in recovering tolls, by the physical force of the country?—Just so.

You have stated that the tolls never were enforced, except within the bounds of the city?—No; I stated that in no case that was ever sought to be brought to trial, did we ever make the demand, except within the bounds of the city.

Have the goodness to state, where were the gates?—There was one at Donnybrook.

Is that on the bounds of the city?—It is. There was another at New street, that was outside the bounds of the city; there was another on Black Rock road, near two miles within the bounds of the city; there was another at Dolphin's Barn, which was on the bounds of the city; there was another in Barrack-street, which is within the bounds of the city; there was another at Storny Batter, which is on the bounds of the city; there was another at Broad-stone, which is within the bounds of the city; there was another at Drumcondra, which was outside the bounds of the city; and there was another at Ballybough-bridge, was inside the bounds of the city.

Then, notwithstanding your having ascertained by legal process and judgment, the rights of the city of Dublin, those rights have been successfully resisted by the physical force of the country?—They have.

You have given evidence on the subject of the butter market; are you aware of the particular provisions of the Butter Act, as prepared by the right honourable member for Waterford?—It is now six or seven years since I was in the habit of acting under it, and I cannot say I recollect it very particularly.

Butter brought to Dublin, and exported from Dublin, must be branded with a double brand?—That is the regulation.

If it comes from Carlow, and is exported from Dublin, it must have the double brand upon it?—Yes.

The butter exported from any port in Dublin, must be branded with the port mark besides the original brand; but is there not likewise a sum payable at all those ports upon that brand; and is there not a particular exemption for Waterford, that it is not branded at Waterford, and therefore Waterford pays no second branding fee?—I believe there is such a clause as that.

Then

J. C. Beresford, Esq.

(28 May.)

Then do you conceive that to be an advantage which the port of Waterford has, which no other port in Ireland has?—Certainly, if that be the fact.

Are you of opinion, that saving the expense of the second brand in all the other ports of Ireland, would not be an advantage to those ports respectively?—I do not think it would; it is often shipped without the second brand.

Do you think it would increase the quantity exported, if it was not liable to the second brand?—I think not, for I think the butter would lose more in point of examination, than it would gain by saving the expense of the brand.

Is it not examined at the weigh-house of the place from which it comes?—It is; but the quality is not branded upon it.

Ought it not, at a regular weigh-house, to have the quality as well as the quantity branded?—I do not think it is necessary, except at the port, because it is under its quality as branded there, and it is shipped.

In point of fact, has not the export butter trade of Waterford increased?—I do not know.

On the subject of tolls, is there not considerable wear and tear of the streets of Dublin, in consequence of the cars coming in from the country laden with the different goods that are sold in the market?—No doubt of it.

Was not that one great reason why the corporation got the toll to keep those roads in repair?—It is the reason why the pavement is particularly appropriated to them of the streets leading to the market.

The charter giving the tolls, prescribed certain works to be done in the first instance by the corporation?—Yes.

Those works caused a considerable advance and expenditure of public money, before the tolls were collected?—They did; a considerable advance of the corporation money.

Therefore the tolls became the purchase of the city of Dublin, in consideration of those expenses?—Yes, subject to duties.

Those duties have all long since been performed with the exception of the paving, which is a continuing duty?—Yes.

Then it is your opinion, that in consequence of having performed those duties, the tolls are absolutely the purchased property of the city of Dublin?—Certainly.

Jovis, 29° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Major James Palmer, again called in; and Examined.

Major James Palmer.

(29 May.)

ARE you acquainted with the situation of the prisons of Dublin, their local situation?—I am.

The prison of Newgate is situated in immediate connection with two other prisons, is it not?—It is.

What are those prisons?—The city marshalsea, and the sheriff's prison.

As far as the mere building goes, one may almost consider those three prisons as one, they lie entirely together, do they not, there is no intervening building?—They are intersected by the sessions house.

The sessions house forms part of the building?—It intervenes between them.

Suppose a physician appointed to attend those three prisons; is there much greater difficulty in attending them as three distinct prisons, in their present shape, than if they were all under one establishment?—I think, if the sick were altogether it would be more convenient.

Suppose in place of three prisons, all separate in themselves, as they now are, that you had three prisons belonging to the one establishment, would there be much greater difficulty in a public officer's duty, in attending the three prisons as at present, than there would be in attending three prisons, if they were conjoined in establishment?—Certainly not, except the small increase of ground to walk over, and the repetition of orders.

Would there be any difference of difficulty, except going up and down stairs?—I think not; except the repetition of orders.

Then

Major James Palmer.

(29 May.)

Then as far as the attendance of the officer goes, you may consider those three prisons, as one great prison of the same extent, containing the same number of prisoners?—Yes.

You visit these three prisons as inspector general?—I do.

What difference would it make to you performing your duties as inspector general, if those three prisons constituted one great prison, or if as at present they constitute three several prisons?—Only the difference of going separately into each, and repeating the same instructions over again, which were they one prison I would have only to do once.

But if they were one prison, would you not have to visit every part of that one prison, to go into every room in the same way that you do in the three distinct prisons?—Yes; the only difference would be the repetition of the orders.

Are you acquainted with the Smithfield penitentiary?—I am.

How far is that removed from the prison of Newgate in Green-street?—About half an English mile.

Is it in the same street, or does more than one street intervene?—I think, King-street alone intervenes; the sheriff's prison turns into King-street; I think it is one long street.

Do you know the situation of the former bridewell in James's-street?—I do.

Was that more or less remote from the prison of Newgate, than the Smithfield penitentiary is?—Much further off.

How far do you conceive the old bridewell in James's-street, to be from Newgate?—A mile at least, I should think.

How far is the Richmond penitentiary from Newgate?—I think, a mile and a half, or more; it may be two English miles.

Is it legal according to the Gaol Act, that a prisoner, supported by the public, receiving the gaol allowance, should, during the time of his support by the public, receive any supplies of food or of liquor elsewhere?—It is not.

That is distinctly contrary to law?—Distinctly; and we have always desired that order to be enforced.

Do you know whether that order is now enforced in Newgate?—It is not enforced in Newgate, but we have given repeated directions that it should be so, and we expect by degrees to be enabled to effect it; considerable difficulties arise from the crowded and unclassified state of Newgate.

Do you not think that if the officers of the prison of Newgate had a disposition to obey your instructions, that they could enforce that provision of the law?—I think they could, but the building is of such a nature, and the crowds so great, that I imagine the officers are willing to make a sacrifice of the law in that particular, for the sake of obtaining quietness and peace amongst the prisoners, who they apprehend might otherwise rebel, and cause great confusion, if not danger.

Does the conduct of the officers, in that particular, meet your approbation?—I cannot say it does entirely; but certainly great allowances are to be made under these circumstances; and creating perfect order in a gaol, where accommodation is not given, is in many cases impracticable.

Did you discover this violation of the law yourself, you and Major Woodward, or was it reported to you by the officers?—We discovered it; we saw them frequently drinking tea and eating meat.

Do you not conceive that such a violation of the law is utterly inconsistent with the due discipline of the prison?—Utterly; at the same time there is considerable difficulty in a gaol where there is no room for classification, and crowded to a desperate extent, in upholding discipline.

Do you conceive, from your experience of the Dublin prisons, that the prisoners committed to Newgate could, generally speaking, provide clothing for themselves?—I think not.

Do you conceive, that the interposition of the public, under the Gaol Act, to assist in providing clothing for prisoners, is indispensably necessary?—I do, from the general class of prisoners that I see confined.

Who is the Roman catholic chaplain of Newgate?—Mr. Morrissy.

Can you inform the Committee, whether he discharges the duties which the law points out to the chaplain of that prison?—I think he does.

Can you inform the Committee, whether the prisoners in that gaol attend to him at chapel in the discharge of his religious functions?—No, many of them have great objections to him.

Major James Palmer.

(29 May.)

On what grounds?—On the grounds, I believe, of his being excommunicated by his own church, or being suspended.

Do you know whether Mr. Morrissy is the Roman catholic curate of that parish?—I believe he is not.

What is the provision of the law with respect to the appointment of the Roman Catholic chaplain, supposing the office to be vacant?—The provision of the law is, that the rector or curate of the parish should be the chaplain, unless there is something against his character.

Mr. Morrissy, as far as in him lies, attends the prison, and performs the duties of his station?—Certainly; I think he is an attentive officer. How far he does the duty agreeable to his own archbishop's directions, is another affair; but he attends regularly.

But, as a suspended chaplain, you know that many of the prisoners have made objections to attending his religious instructions?—Yes, many complaints have come to us on that ground.

Do you know why he has been suspended?—No I do not.

Who is the presbyterian clergyman of the prison?—Doctor Horner.

From your experience of the prisoners of Dublin, do you conceive the appointment of a presbyterian or dissenting minister is necessary for those prisons?—I think there are very few presbyterians in gaol; but under the present circumstances of the Dublin gaols, the protestant chaplain being a very old man, and having infinitely more to do than he can well perform, I do consider that Doctor Horner has been very useful.

Then you consider the great utility of Doctor Horner to consist rather in his acting for the protestant chaplain of the establishment, than for any duties specifically imposed upon him?—Yes, I have known him to do so with advantage; and I would add, that I think one protestant chaplain to the gaols of Dublin is not sufficient; the present one is a very old man; but even were he a young man, I think, if he did his duty fully, he has more to do than he can do well, unless the gaols were united.

Do you conceive, that, under the administration of the city grand juries, the contract system can be carried into effect with economy to the public?—I think it could be better done on an improved practice, such as I have before recommended.

Do you think, that, if any public office, such as the head office of police, were authorized to receive tenders for all contracts, and to lay those tenders before the grand jury, any check of the public office so interposed, would ensure a fairer administration of the contract system?—I think it would probably produce more economy, that is cheaper contracts by a greater competition coming forward.

Are you aware of any difference of delivery between the articles really given and the articles contracted for by sample in the Dublin prisons?—Frequent complaints have been made to me, of the inferior quality of the provisions, especially in potatoes.

Have any complaints been made to you of the inferior qualities of blankets and other articles furnished by contract?—No complaints have been made to me.

Have you ever complained of blankets delivered in by sample upon which the contract was founded?—No, I have not; but I have inspected the blankets at my annual inspection, as I was bound to do, and I thought them sufficiently good.

Without reference to price or pattern?—Yes.

Who is the keeper of the prison at Newgate?—A Mr. Bournes.

Does he hold any other office besides that of keeper of Newgate?—I do not know.

Does he reside in the prison?—He does; there is a building in the rear of it for him.

Can you inform the Committee, what is the new system of classification which has been adopted by government in Dublin, in pursuance of the recommendation of the inspector's general?—Prisoners sentenced to six months confinement and upwards under the proclamation, go to the Richmond bridewell, those under six months, except boys, remain at Newgate, the boys are transferred to Smithfield penitentiary, the female convicts are to go to Smithfield penitentiary, when cells are prepared for them, and the male convicts for Botany Bay, remain in Newgate till embarked, which latter class I consider very injurious to the discipline of Newgate or any gaol.

Are they embarked very soon after sentence is pronounced, or does any considerable delay occur?—Considerable delays have occurred in all parts of Ireland.

Does not the continuance of the convicts in gaol after sentence pronounced,

Major James Palmer.

(29 May.)

materially interfere with the internal discipline of the prison?—Very much so; if I could find stronger language to express the mischief that arises from it, I would do so, but provision has been made under the late Act for their removal immediately after each assizes, and a hulk is preparing at the Cove of Cork for the purpose of receiving those convicts, preparatory to their embarking for Botany Bay.

How soon is that system likely to be acted upon?—I think immediately, with the exception of Dublin.

Does the system to which you have alluded, apply to the city of Dublin?—It does.

Do you not consider that by this Act, the regulations, with regard to prisons, apply to Newgate?—I do.

Will you have the goodness to look at the Act, (*handing it to the witness*), are not all the acts which are authorized to be done by grand juries at assizes, in the counties of Ireland, authorized and empowered to be done by the city of Dublin grand juries at presenting term?—It would appear to me to be so from this, but I know it is doubted by the grand juries of the city of Dublin; they consulted a lawyer upon the subject who decided against their having a power to appoint a committee, and they are excepted as to that in a former clause.

Will you have the goodness to read the section of the Act?—"Provided always, and be it further enacted, that all the acts and duties to be performed by the several grand juries at the assizes under this Act, may in the county of Dublin, and in the county of the city of Dublin, be performed by the grand juries at the presenting terms, duly met and impanelled."

The subsequent exemption of the city of Dublin, from the operation of this Act only applies to certain prisons, to what prisons does it apply?—To the four court marshalsea and the city marshalsea.

Have you any doubt that the provisions of that Act do apply to the prisons of Dublin, save and except the four court marshalsea and the city marshalsea?—None whatever, except as to the committee.

Do you happen to know the circumstances under which Mr. Morrissy was appointed chaplain of Newgate?—I do not, it was before my time, and I never inquired; I have heard constantly that he was there in opposition to the wish of the archbishop.

You have heard he was suspended by his bishop?—I did.

Did you hear that the cause of that suspension was his obstinately continuing to do the duties of that prison, contrary to the archbishop's wish or directions?—I think I heard that as one of the causes.

Did you hear any other cause?—I think I heard also that the archbishop disapproved of his liberality, in allowing the Bible to be read there by Roman catholics.

Those are the two causes you have heard assigned as the causes of his suspension?—I may have heard others, but I am not aware.

From whom did you hear them?—I think I have heard Mr. Morrissy say so himself.

You have stated, that you think the contracts of the Dublin grand jury would be more beneficially carried on, if contracts were to be accepted at the head police office?—I meant to say in conjunction with the committee, which I recommended the last day.

Are you aware that the contracts are all handed in to the secretary of the grand jury, on or before the first day of term?—I have heard so.

Are you aware that no contracts can be received after the grand jury meet?—I should think not consistently with the advertisement.

Are you aware that all the contracts that are received by the secretary, are upon oath, laid before the court?—I understand they are.

If any contract of any human being was suppressed by any person whatever, would not he have an opportunity by attending in court, of discovering that suppression?—I think so; nor can I imagine that there is such a thing as a suppression.

Then what advantage do you conceive would arise from having the intervention of the head police, or any other public office, to receive those proposals?—I think it probable that the public would come forward; more contracts would be offered; but I speak merely from opinion.

In point of fact, do the police office contract upon better terms themselves, for the things provided for the police establishment, than the grand jury do?—I do not know.

Major James Palmer.

(29 May.)

Then in point of fact, if the citizens of Dublin chose to avail themselves of the opportunities of the present system, can you conceive the possibility of any abuse existing, either in the tenders for contracts, or the selection of the contractors?—I think if any abuse exists, it cannot be in that way.

Neither in the tenders, or in the choice of contracts?—Certainly.

In point of fact, under the system as it is at present regulated, do you conceive it is possible for any partiality to be shown?—I do think that the lowest contract is taken.

Can there be any partiality?—I think not.

Do you conceive that the present system of receiving contracts by the grand jury has the effect of inviting as fair and public competition, as any other system that can be devised?—I think not; because I think any other body in unison at least with the committee of the grand jury, receiving proposals, would probably have the effect of bringing more offers.

What improvements in the present system and mode of advertising, and receiving tenders, and selecting contracts, would you propose?—I would propose that the magistrates of the head police office, in unison with a mixed committee of the grand jury, should receive the tenders for contracts previous to the term, and I apprehend the effect of that would be, or might be, bringing in a greater number of proposals.

Are not the tenders now received, all previous to the term?—They are.

Then the alteration you suggest, is in the person to receive the proposals, and not in the mode of sending in the proposals?—I do think a responsibility would attach to the magistrates of the police office and to the committee, that does not so much attach to the grand jury as a body; and more time would be procured for inquiry; the committees of county gaols frequently contract.

Do you think that no responsibility attaches to the court of King's Bench, before whom these proposals must be made?—I think it does attach responsibility, but I do not apprehend the court would interfere, unless they were asked to do so; unless fault was found, they would take for granted that the thing was right.

Do they generally see all the proposals that are sent in to the grand jury?—I do not know, but I suppose they do.

Have you ever heard of a change in the contractor for bread occurring, two or three years ago, in the Dublin grand juries?—I think I have heard of a change.

Do you recollect who was the former contractor?—Alderman Manders, I have heard.

Have you heard that he was under bid by half a farthing in the quartern loaf, and lost the contract accordingly, to a perfect stranger?—I believe he lost the contract by being under bid.

Have you heard that from that day to this, he has been uniformly under bid, and never got it again, though he has been an uniform bidder?—I have not heard it.

John Crosbie Graves, Esq. called in; and Examined.

J. C. Graves, Esq.

WHAT office do you hold in the city of Dublin?—I am the barrister magistrate of the head office of police.

The watch tax of the city of Dublin comes under your cognizance?—It is entirely under the regulation of the head office of police.

The expense of the police establishment itself, is defrayed by the state?—It is defrayed by the state, except so far as there are certain other sources of revenue that go in reduction of the total expense.

Those certain sources of revenue are applicable to the watch establishment, are they not?—Some of them are to the police, there are fees, penalties and forfeitures, under penal statutes, that go to the general funds of the police establishment, also hotel and other licences.

The rents of offices, the taxes, the salaries and law expenses, and the expenses of the patroles and constables, are comprehended under the parliamentary grant?—They are in point of fact, but the limitation of the amount of parliamentary grant, to a certain number of thousand pounds, I believe twenty-nine thousand British, is over and above rents, repairs, and building of houses, watch-houses and police offices, so that there may be all those disbursements for rents, &c. exclusive of that sum, as is also the case in the London Act; hitherto, I believe, there has not been occasion to carry it to the extent of that sum.

Upon the face of the account submitted from your office to parliament, through the commissioners of audit, the whole expense of stationery amounted to 1,600*l.* which

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

which appears chargeable upon the watch establishment; does that comprehend the expenses of stationery for both branches of establishment, both police and watch?—I apprehend not.

Looking at the return, can you show the Committee any charge for stationery included in the whole branch of the expense, which is exactly covered in the parliamentary grant?—It there appears that there is an item of 519*l.* 4*s.* 5*d.* charged for stationery and books of the police establishment, under the head public offices, and which is defrayed out of the parliamentary grant, the 1,634*l.* chargeable on the watch establishment is exclusive of this; the amount of the charge being so much larger in the watch proceeds from the very detailed nature of the account; the various and minute sources from which the funds of that department are derived, (such as licences, house, carriage, and other taxes, requiring a great deal of machinery, and a multiplicity of documents applicable to very small sums;) I believe, also, that charge of 1,634*l.* includes the publication of the Hue and Cry.

What was the expense of the publication of the Hue and Cry; how much has it been reduced, and by what means?—It averaged for each quarter, I think, about 166*l.* making 665*l.* a year.

What does it amount to now?—500*l.*

What is the object of that publication?—The object of that publication is the detection of offenders and the recovery of stolen property, by rewards offered in that paper.

It is put in general circulation throughout Ireland?—Yes; to the magistracy of the different counties and cities.

Do you not conceive that charge to fall more properly within the scope of the parliamentary grant for police purposes, than the local charge for watch establishment?—It is matter of opinion, and I think a great deal depends upon the fact (which I am not apprised of) as to what was the case before the present police establishment was formed, if the Hue and Cry was then so charged, I think it would naturally continue under the same head.

To whom is the check and audit of the accounts of the watch establishment chiefly committed?—To the alderman magistrate, the chief magistrate of police, Alderman Darley.

Do all the accounts pass through the head police office?—Yes.

Who are the magistrates of that office, besides youself?—Alderman Darley and Major Charles Henry Sirr.

Does the constitution of the police office require that there should be two gentlemen belonging to the corporation of the city of Dublin, and one a barrister?—Yes, that is the constitution; there is a difference as to the mode of appointment of those that belong to the city, but they must all belong to the corporation, either as aldermen or sheriff's peers, or common councilmen.

By whom is the selection of the sheriff's peers and common councilmen, as police magistrates, made?—Three of the aldermen and three of the sheriff's peers are directly nominated by the crown; and the remaining six, three of each description are elected by the city.

How many police magistrates are there?—Eighteen. There are six police offices, with three magistrates in each office.

How are the watch appointed in the city of Dublin?—By the magistrates of the head office of police.

There is no control exercised over their appointment by the vestries of the several parishes?—None; there is no interference that I know of, with respect to the watch, except as to the churchwardens being directed to suggest to the magistrates of police proper stations.

Do you not conceive it essential to the due administration of the police in the city of Dublin, that the watchmen should be appointed under the control, and at the responsibility of the magistrates?—I do consider it essential; I am convinced, the strict superintendence and summary power of the police magistrates, acting upon complaint, and investigating into matters of this kind, are essential to the good conduct of the watch.

What are the class of men they generally select for watchmen?—I do not apprehend there is any exclusive class of men; there was at first rather a partiality for pensioners, and in practice it turned out that there were objections to them; they were for the most part apt to prove worn out, and to come as a charge on the establishment, through their not being able to bear the night duty, sooner than other men,

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

men, whose constitutions were not impaired by service, and who had more of their time before them, and they are not, in point of fact, so good characters as one would expect.

Is it the duty of the police magistrates to provide for the building of watchhouses in the city of Dublin?—Yes.

Does that frequently entail considerable expenses?—I am not aware of its frequently being so; I believe there has been actually erected but one; I know of but one watchhouse erected in Dublin.

Will you look at the return of 1821; does there not appear there, charged as against the public, one thousand pounds for watchhouses?—There does appear a charge for repairs including a sum of 1,000 *l.* 8*s.* 8½*d.* for building two watchhouses, &c. as per estimate, 1,065 *l.* 1 *s.* 0½*d.*

What course does the office pursue in undertaking building of watchhouses or repairs?—There is a police architect, who estimates and superintends the work; and I believe that the course is, to contract for any works under the police, by public advertisement.

Is there an open contract system?—Yes, I believe invariably in all contracts.

Are you aware who have been the contractors for that building?—I am not; it was before I came into the head office; and its rests entirely with the magistrates of the head office.

Are not part of the police expenses, or the watch expenses, defrayed by charges made upon the cars and carriages?—Yes, there is a scale, under the Carriage Act, of licence duties on all descriptions of carriages, varying in amount.

What is lobbing?—It is going off the stand, looking out for fares off the stand.

Is there not a licence duty paid upon the cars and drays in the city of Dublin? Yes, there is.

Can you inform the Committee what is the amount of that licence duty?—Not at this moment; further than that, in the year 1822, the total amount on job carriages, carts, cars, and sedan chairs, was 4,738 *l.* 3 *s.* 8 *d.* I shall be able to do so upon reference to documents, but I cannot do it now.

Are there not two separate charges upon cars and carriages and sedan chairs; the one a licence, and the other a subsequent charge in the shape of rent?—Yes; both authorized by the Carriage Act.

Does the police acquire any additional power of regulation, in consequence of the payment of these licences duty, or this rent from the cars?—A great deal; it affords a vast deal of convenience in detecting any offence or impropriety.

Do you not conceive that that would be the same, whether exercised under the ordinary powers of police, or as it is now exercised under the payment of a tax?—No?

Why not?—Because the necessity of taking out numbers and giving the name and residence, gives an amazing facility in the detection of any impropriety.

Supposing it were made imperative by the legislature still to take out the name and the number, do you think the continuance of the tax is necessarily connected with the due administration of the police?—It requires the employment of a number of persons, who from the giving out of the licence and their employments as inspectors, to regulate the conduct of owners and drivers of cars, the collection of the rents, and the penalties arising from them have an interest in detecting irregularities, and this undoubtedly tends to more effectually keeping them in order than would be the case under an enactment, that did not make it the interest of a particular class of persons to look after them.

It is not the object of the question to suggest the removal of any penalty or restriction, but you are requested to state to the Committee, whether continuing the system of penalty and taking out numbers, you conceive the continuance of the tax to be necessary for the purpose of the police?—I think that nothing is so effectual to give a knowledge of the parties and a facility of coming at them, as their being obliged to come to the police for some licence, however small.

The necessity of resorting to the police for licence is not necessarily connected with the payment of a tax; do not you conceive that the licensing itself without the tax would be equally effectual?—The tax interests a certain number of persons in the collection of it, those who are employed for that purpose and in the duties connected with it, which in my view of it, affords a great advantage; besides, if there were no charge for licence, all the expense would fall on the establishment without any return.

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

Would not the persons be equally interested in the collection of penalties, in case the law was violated?—The collection of the penalties would then be for any individual, and the persons collecting the penalties would be merely volunteers; but there are now persons whose duty it is as car inspectors and carriage inspectors, to look after the thing, and their duty arises out of the licence system, and the collection of the taxes.

Is there a duty upon job carriages in the city of Dublin?—There is both a duty and a rent.

Is there not a duty also upon jaunting cars and inferior carriages lent for hire?—Yes.

Is there not a duty upon cars and all carriages used for the purposes of trade?—Yes.

Do you not consider, that the continuance of this duty upon cars and drays, for the purposes of trade, must operate as a restriction and difficulty imposed upon the individuals carrying on trade?—So far as the amount of the duty goes, it certainly is one of the circumstances lessening their profits.

Do you know any other city in which there is a tax so collected upon cars and drays used for the purposes of trade?—I can not now name one; but I am not certain that such a tax is peculiar to Dublin.

What establishment of constables have you in your office?—One chief and three office constables, and twenty-seven peace officers.

Are there not charges made for the purposes of the police, upon persons having stalls in the streets and markets?—There are.

Those individuals are, generally speaking, amongst the poorest classes of the community?—Yes; those in the street particularly.

Are many of the individuals, who pay the licence duty and the rent for cars, amongst the poorest classes in the community?—No, I should think not; there are few people, I rather believe, who hold but one, they generally are proprietors who employ the drivers; and in point of fact, I believe, most car owners are proprietors of more than one car, some, I know, are owners of several; but of the whole class, I would be understood to speak doubtfully.

Can you state the amount of the expenses of the watch and police of the city of Dublin, in any one year?—I take it, that in a year the combined expense is something above 47,000 *l.*

Out of that sum, how much was the expense of the public offices?—The total expense of the whole establishment; what I would call the expense of the offices (including horse and foot patroles for town and country) is about 25,000 *l.*

What is the whole expense of the police establishment?—About 28,000 *l.* to 30,000 *l.* including all incidents; and I should observe, that by the Police Act, 1,000 *l.* per annum is charged upon the police funds for the salary of the recorder.

That does not comprehend the stationery?—Not all the stationery; some is charged upon the watch.

Are you aware, what the expense of the police offices of the city of London amounted to in the year 1821?—I believe, about 68,000 *l.*

By a return laid before Parliament, the amount of the whole expenses of the seven police offices in the city of London, appear to amount to 21,000 *l.*?—Then that must be the expense of the offices merely, without the patroles or any thing of that kind; that must be as compared with 11,600 *l.* which is the charge of the five divisional offices for the city of Dublin; for I believe, that the Bow-street office alone was above 33,000 *l.* for the last year. Upon any comparison of that kind it should be remembered, that the expense of those seven offices is exclusive of Bow-street and of the carriage office, which in London is a separate establishment; and also that it does not comprise the total or any thing like the total of the expense of the London police, because there is besides the whole local department of the city of London, properly so called, and of the borough of Southwark; the entire of the watch establishment should also be added, which in London is defrayed by the respective parishes.

Who is the officer appointed by the police, in order to collect and pay the monies accruing from the police duties?—He is not appointed by the police, he is appointed by government.

What is his name?—John Cathcart Lees, receiver to the public offices.

What are the duties of that office?—The duties of that office are to receive from the chief clerks of the several police offices, the various collectors of those licence, watch

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

watch and other duties, fines, penalties, and so on, all the sums applicable to the police establishment, as well as the parliamentary grant paid into his hands, to lodge such receipts whenever they amount to 100*l.* in the bank of Ireland, to draw orders on the bank for payment of all salaries and incidents, to take receipts and then to pass accounts quarterly before the police magistrates of the head office, and annually before the commissioners of imprest accounts.

Do you know what the salary of that officer is?—Five hundred pounds a year.

Is that salary charged upon the police establishment, or upon the watch establishment?—Upon the police establishment.

How is the watch tax collected, under what authority?—Under the authority of the magistrates of the head office of police, as directed by the Act of the 48th of the late King, vesting in the police the power of the former superintending magistrates, which I believe are under the 39th and 40th of the late King.

Whom do you employ to collect them?—Six collectors of watch-tax, who are by Act of Parliament authorized to deduct a poundage not exceeding one shilling in the pound, which sum they accordingly receive; there is also a supervisor of watch-tax.

Do you not conceive, that a general office for the receipt and collection of all the local taxes, paying over to the police that portion of the local taxes belonging to them, would be an alteration of the system most beneficial to the public?—I should consider it both convenient and economical; for I take it for granted, that if the taxes were consolidated, so that a good deal might be received at the same time at one house, it would put an end to repeated importunities, and by one individual collecting the whole for a certain district, would enable the collection to be made at a lower rate of poundage.

What is the rate of poundage charged by the collectors of the watch and other local taxes?—I believe the general rate in Dublin applicable to all the local taxes, is one shilling in the pound.

There is no such per centage upon the amount of the Parliamentary grant?—Certainly not.

Have the police officers much difficulty in procuring proper persons to collect the money?—No, I believe not; I believe there are always candidates for that office.

Have you never known any losses in consequence of insolvencies?—Never, but in one instance; I had occasion to hear of one instance which took place very soon after the establishment of the police, and I believe there has been no recurrence of it; it was the case of a man of the name of Roberts, who was appointed immediately after the establishment of the police, and he absconded with the sum, I believe, of about 220*l.*

Was that sum lost to the public?—It was; and as I have heard, the defaulter lost his life, that he was pursued to Liverpool, and in absconding from thence to America, fell overboard.

Is there any security taken for the due discharge of the duties of those collectors?—There is.

Were Roberts's sureties sued or proceeded against?—I believe so.

Was the amount recovered from them?—No; it so happened that one of them I have heard was a person of the name of Fox, who was a very extensive butcher in one of the markets, another was his father-in-law, who was a respectable person at the time that he became his surety; the security was for 200*l.* each, both having failed, the proceedings were unproductive; there was a very great and general failure and mercantile distress in the year 1810.

Of what class in life are those collectors?—I have never had any thing to do with the appointment of any one of them; I do not believe any removal has taken place since I came into the office, but I see respectable looking individuals coming in and passing their accounts.

You have no kind of doubt, that if the whole were consolidated, you could get a higher description of persons to perform the duty?—If the whole of the local taxes, the minister's money, the watch tax, the paving tax, and the various other local dues, were collected together, unquestionably a superior description of persons might be procured, and it would probably be worth the while of those respectable individuals to take a lesser poundage; but at the same time with respect to the collection of the watch tax, nothing has occurred in the way of deficit to the public, except in that single instance.

What powers of recovery of arrears are there under the watch tax?—The power of distress on a warrant.

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

Who is employed to execute that warrant?—The collectors take to themselves assistants in case of obstruction.

Then do you not conceive that considerable advantage would be given to the community by any thing that placed this power in the hands of any persons more respectable than those now employed?—I do not look much to that so far as respects the watch, for I believe they are respectable individuals; I have not heard of any instance of oppression; and the instance of deficiency I have mentioned, is the only one that I know of, and therefore I cannot conceive any great advantage resulting in that respect.

Do you, or do you not conceive that the system would be better administered, if you had persons of a higher description?—Generally speaking, I have already said so.

How are the insolvencies returned to the police officers, with whom does the discretion rest of returning houses as insolvent and unable to pay?—The collectors report them to the magistrates, and they are in point of fact rated as insolvent, when they do not pay for more than two years; they are placed in the insolvent arrears after that time.

By what evidence do the magistrates decide, whether a house is insolvent or not in the first year?—It is not decided and returned as insolvent actually upon one year's arrears; the collectors return them as arrears.

Is there any control exercised by the magistrates as to the returns of arrears, which after two years become insolvent?—The collectors are sometimes brought before the magistrates and examined upon oath, and asked why they have not collected from such a house, and they must make a statement that satisfies the magistrates.

Have you ever, as a magistrate, been called upon to inquire into the circumstance of any of those returns of arrears and insolvencies?—I have not; it is not in the department of the office that I am practically conversant with, but I have frequently been called upon, as magistrate, to determine upon memorials for relief, and then there is an investigation, and in that way I have very often had to consider the question of enforcing the levy of the tax.

That is in the case where an individual is pressed to pay the tax; but in the case where an individual is returned by the collector in arrear and has not paid the tax, there can be no memorial in that case?—The collector has nothing to do with the charge; the receiver to the public offices is bound to account on oath quarterly, on that account he is charged with the full amount of the rate; he is *primâ facie* responsible, and he is bound to discharge himself by the return of the collector, verified by affidavit, showing some sufficient reasons why he has not collected upon the return; the collector is thus made to account upon oath, at least quarterly, for his actual receipts; he returns certain sums as not paid; he is sworn distinctly to such receipts being all that he has received, the other being in arrear, though called for once or more; he is sworn to such a return, and he accounts in a looser way, not upon oath, once a week.

Have the number of insolvencies returned to the watch establishment, considerably increased?—In a very remarkable degree.

Will you state the return of insolvencies in the parish of Saint Michan, in the several years?—In the year 1814, the return is 341 houses; in the year 1815, 414; in the year 1816, 708; in the year 1817, 904; in the year 1818, 906; in the year 1819, 1,093; and in the year 1820, 1,156; and I have heard from an acquaintance of the clergyman of that parish, that his receipts for minister's money, have run down in very much the same proportion.

Are you aware, whether any application was made, on behalf of any of the parishes in Dublin, to your office to get an account of the insolvencies?—There was an application from a deputation from the parish of St. Mary's, that waited upon our office for that purpose, I believe amongst others, and they were referred by us to our secretary, with a direction and every wish on our part to give them all the information he could, and I believe they so received it.

Do you know that they so received it?—They did not come back to me with any complaint, they were with the secretary more than one day; I believe to the interruption of his other business.

You never heard that they were refused it?—Indeed, I did not; I directed it to be done for I wished not to have the least secrecy.

How do you account for the tax, which is collected by your establishment, seeming less productive and showing more insolvencies, than the tax collected by the paving board?—I rather believe, that there is a more ready attention to memorials and

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

and a more lenient mode of acting in the collection of the tax in our department, than in the other department referred to, besides the power of recovery is lost after two years.

Do you not conceive that that is a fair principle in all local taxes?—I do.

Have you ever heard of instances in Dublin, of great hardships arising in consequence of a large accumulated charge on other taxes?—Decidedly so; such as parish rate, church cess, and pipe water; the parish cess is personal and does not follow the house; but in the church rate, if there is the smallest want of candour in the person disposing of a house, or want of caution in the person taking it, he will perhaps find a heavy charge upon the house.

Have you ever known any instances of that hardship arise?—Yes, I have known several instances; they occurred to me in this way, not in my own office, or division, but sitting for Mr. Casey, when confined by illness, at the Marlborough-street office, a great number of such cases were heard by me, and I found that with respect to the parish cess, when there was a new occupier, I could give relief on the ground that it was a personal charge, and did not follow the house; but in the church cess that I could not give any relief, and several parties that were before me, I believe, a very considerable number had very heavy charges to pay, which appeared to me to form cases of considerable hardship.

Does not this same principle apply to the pipe, water and metal main taxes?—I conceive so.

What salaries do you pay the watchmen?—Ten shillings Irish money per week.

Has that been the salary which has always been paid by the office?—Yes, and besides that, they get a great coat and accoutrements.

They are armed, are they not?—With a pole of a particular construction, and a rattle.

They have a pike, have they not?—They have a pike at the end of the pole, a kind of halbert.

Has there been any reduction in the salaries of the watch establishment since the general fall of prices throughout the city of Dublin?—I do not think there has; it is nothing but the wonderful want of employment that enables us with that small salary, to get trust-worthy persons, but the bad times have been in our favour in that respect.

Do you find the police men frequently neglect their duty?—I would say not frequently, in proportion to their number; but there is an extreme strictness on the part of the magistrates, they being sure that they can always get good candidates, therefore dismissals do occasionally take place, much more among the patroles and out of door men than in the office constables.

You had occasion to dismiss some in the case of the riot at the theatre?—Yes.

How many did you dismiss?—Either nine or eleven, I am not sure which; it appeared to us upon investigation, that there was a want of energy on their part; that if they had apprehended some persons earlier who had shown clubs in the gallery, it would probably have prevented the riot and throwing of missiles that afterwards took place; they were dismissed upon an investigation taking place, directly under the authority of the head office of police.

Do you think a military person would be a better person to command the police in Dublin?—I should think, certainly not; it is a civil power altogether, requiring education and experience of another kind.

Have you ever read a copy of the petition presented to the House of Commons, by the householders of the parish of St. Peter's?—No, I do not think I have read a copy of the petition; I read the statement of the proceedings at the parish of St. Peter's; but I did not read the petition founded upon it, that I recollect.

[*The petition was handed to the witness.*]

Have you seen the petition of the householders of St. Peter's parish?—I have now.

Have you read that part of it relating to the police establishment of the city of Dublin?—I have.

It contains the following words, "That your petitioners beg leave to call the at-
" tention of the House to the large sums granted to the police establishment, which
" exclusive of that advanced by government, exceeds the annual sum of 20,000 *l.*
" and they have likewise to complain of the great and undue influence vested in
" the corporation of Dublin, under certain provisions in the Police Act of 1808,
" giving the appointment from that body of all the magistrates of police, with the

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

" exception of the professional ones, and which they submit to this honourable " House, requires alteration and amendment;" is that a true or correct statement?—It is incorrect I take it, in the first instance, with respect to the annual sums stated.

Is it untrue in some facts?—It is.

In what particulars do you conceive it to be incorrect?—I conceive the expense of the police establishment does not at all, or by a very trifling sum indeed, exceed the Parliamentary grant.

Does the police establishment cost the city of Dublin one farthing?—I think not, except so far as the city of Dublin is a portion of the empire, and shares in the general taxation at large, and in that way its proportion, is, I should suppose, much less than one hundredth part of the whole, and does not amount to 300 *l.*

Then you conceive the police establishment of Dublin, so far as they are a police establishment, form no part of the local burdens of the city of Dublin?—Certainly not; I conceive that by the bounty of the legislature, the city of Dublin are presented with the police establishment free of expense.

Then, in point of fact, the citizens of Dublin only pay the watch?—Yes.

So far as the petition states the expense of the police establishment it is incorrect?—It is, not only in point of amount, but the statement of it as a local burden on the citizens of Dublin is absolutely unfounded.

In point of fact, has there been any increase of the watch tax, within your memory, of the city of Dublin?—Not within my memory, and it remains still as assessed under the 35th of the late king.

So far as the expense of both police and watch are together, the city of Dublin only pay the whole of the watch tax, all the excess is paid by the country at large?—Certainly.

What part of the statement which has been read to you is positively false?—I do not think that statement is untrue respecting the appointment of the police magistrates, with the exception of the professional ones being from the body of the corporation.

Who is the appointment given to?—The appointments are made from the body of the corporation of all except the professional ones, though the persons appointed are not appointed by that body.

What proportion of the police magistrates are appointed by the city of Dublin?—One-third of the whole; six magistrates out of eighteen.

One-third are appointed by government out of the corporation, one-third by the corporation from amongst themselves, and one-third by the lord-lieutenant from professional men, that is to say, barristers of six years standing?—Yes.

But in point of fact, government have the power of removing all or any of those?—Yes; but I think, by the spirit of the Act, it must be for cause, I conceive not at pleasure; the tenure of the office is during good behaviour; a power of removal is certainly given to the lord-lieutenant, but it is given to him in this way, having been formerly vested by proceeding to attachment in the court of King's Bench for misconduct; the power that was vested in the King's Bench is now vested in the lord-lieutenant.

The whole amount of the expenses of your department, including the police and watch, you have stated, in the year 1821, to amount to 47,000 *l.*?—Yes.

The parliamentary grant, in that year, amounted to 28,000 *l.*?—Yes.

Consequently, the excess was 19,000 *l.*?—Yes; but there were incidents that came in incidental funds, that assisted in the payment of that sum.

The expenses of the establishment being 47,000 *l.* and the Parliamentary grant being 28,000 *l.* the difference is 19,000 *l.* which is paid by the inhabitants of Dublin, is not that so?—It is paid by the inhabitants of Dublin, or by other persons who being convicted, have paid penalties under penal statutes.

How much did the fines and penalties, and incidents of that kind amount to, in 1821?—By this account, 1,272 *l.* composed the fees and fines from divisional offices, figures, fees, fines and penalties, altogether amounting to 1,272 *l.* 1 *s.*

The balance is raised by local assessment?—The balance of rather more than 17,000 *l.* is raised by local assessment of different kinds, the watch tax, licence duties, &c.

And is administered as such by the head police office?—Yes.

By the authority of the Act of Parliament?—Yes, vested in them together with the watch establishment.

J. C. Graves,
Esq.

(29 May.)

Having stated that the police magistrates are partly appointed by the corporation, partly from the corporation, and partly at the nomination of government, will you have the goodness to state, whether there is any distinction between the duties performed by the professional magistrates appointed by government, and the magistrates appointed as belonging to the corporation?—There is no distinction of powers, but in point of practice in the offices, there is some distinction of duties.

What is that distinction?—I take it that the investigation of all matters of law and all charges of a serious nature, framing committals upon them, and deciding upon and framing convictions under penal statutes, all judicial acts and legal inquiries, are in general taken care of by the barrister of the office.

By law, the barrister appointed to the police office, is not allowed to practise professionally?—No; he must make the entire sacrifice of his profession; he cannot even give an opinion, or draw a conveyance.

Is this exclusion from practice necessary, in your opinion?—So far as respects criminal business, I think it is founded on principle; and as to court business in general, it is necessary to prevent an interference with the office hours of duty, but not so as to chamber business; and with reference to the smallness of his salary, I think it a great hardship on the barrister.

Is there any restriction with regard to any duties in trade, or in private life, or in profession, with respect to the corporate magistrates?—None.

Therefore, a corporate magistrate who is a merchant or a banker, or engaged in business, is not required to make that sacrifice which is required of the professional magistrate?—Certainly, he is not.

In point of fact, are many corporate magistrates of the city of Dublin engaged in other avocations?—I believe almost all; but their attention is of course withdrawn in some measure, from their trade.

It does not in any other respect interfere with their personal engagements or trades?—It interferes no further than the hours of attendance at the office; and on the other hand it is an advantage to their trade, by increasing their income.

Are there any additional duties, either by law or in consequence of the distinction which you have pointed out, cast upon the professional magistrates?—There are; I suppose from a sense of the probable necessity of the judgment of the barrister being frequently resorted to; there is a clause in the Act of Parliament, requiring him to attend, not only his regular turn of duty, but upon all occasions when required in writing, by one of the other magistates.

Independently of that provision to which you have alluded, is there an additional weight of business thrown upon the barristers, in consequence of the private avocations of the corporate magistrates elsewhere?—There is occasionally; for instance during the year that any one of the corporate magistrates serve the office of lord mayor, he is entirely discharged from attendance at the office.

Have you ever known a police magistrate appointed as lord mayor?—Repeatedly; the present lord mayor is a police magistrate.

Have you ever known police magistrates appointed to serve upon grand juries?—Frequently.

The grand juries to which you refer, are the presenting grand juries?—The term grand juries, generally.

Do not those grand juries sit for a considerable length of time?—They sit during the law term, usually for the whole of the first week, and occasionally on other days.

Therefore, during the time of their continuance in office as lord mayor, or during the discharge of the grand jury duties, they are exempted from the duties of their magisterial office?—They are not exempted, but withdrawn by those other engagements, there is an understood exemption, but at the same time they are not altogether withdrawn during the period of their attendance as grand jurors.

Do you consider the entire devotement of your time and attention, and you being entirely prevented from professional engagements, to be absolutely necessary to the discharge of your functions?—In the discharge of my present duties, as respects the head office of police, I certainly could not undertake professional business, even in chambers; I am very generally occupied for five or six hours a day in the office, and very frequently I have to take home papers and prepare correspondence, reports, &c. in the evenings.

Are the duties of your office very arduous?—Very arduous; and in the present state of Ireland very anxious also.

You

J. C. Graves, Esq.

(29 May.)

You conceive that those duties could not be so well performed, if your attention was diverted by professional avocations?—Certainly not.

Then do you conceive that the duties of the corporate magistrates can be so well performed, as if they also were obliged to an entire abstinence from any other conflicting duties?—I think, under the present arrangement of the police offices, there is no want of attention at all; there is, I believe, a full and sufficient attendance of magistrates for the discharge of the public business, at least, in the two offices with which I am personally conversant; I have had the good fortune to be assisted by very intelligent and attentive magistrates.

Do you think that the duty would be better done by these magistrates, in case they were obliged to give up their entire attention to it?—I think, that according to the present constitution of the police, there is a sufficient actual attendance.

What do you mean by the present constitution?—The number of magistrates that are appointed under the Act.

Do you think that two magistrates would suffice for each office, if obliged to give up their entire attention to it?—No; by the provisions of the Police Act and several other statutes, two magistrates are in many instances required to act together; and therefore the occasional illness, or necessary absence of one, renders a third actually necessary.

Then might not the number of offices be reduced on the principle of exclusive attention being required to the magisterial duties?—If any reduction were to be made, I think that would be the most feasible mode; but any such plan would involve many circumstances, such as claims of increased salaries for increased labour, compensations for the magistrates reduced, &c. the consideration of which is not for me.

Is it not part of the duty of your office to attend the inspection and regulation of gaols?—Yes, if it is desired; I could give a statement of the duties of the police magistrates in general, and of the special ones attending the office I hold.

Are you able to inform the Committee, what has been the amount of duty paid from the stall keepers in aid of the police funds?—I am, for the last seven years.

How much was it in the year 1816, and how much in the subsequent years?—In the year 1816, 94*l.*; in 1817, 88*l.*; in 1818, 96*l.*; in 1819, 108*l.*; in 1820, 94*l.*; in 1821, 42*l.*; and in 1822, only 6*l.*

Do you consider those sums to include the licence, as well as the annual payment?—I believe there is no annual payment in the way of rent for the stall keepers, there are the licences annually that is all.

Is there any reason to imagine that this tax paid by stall keepers has been more negligently collected in latter years than in former years?—There is not.

Then do you attribute the falling off of the tax to the increased poverty of the parties?—I should suppose that it has arisen from their being people in a very humble class of life, and being peculiarly affected by the circumstances of the times.

Are you able to furnish the Committee with the amount of the annual tax paid upon cars and carts, as distinguished from the tax paid upon jaunting carriages and sedan chairs?—I am not at present.

Can you furnish the Committee with that information?—I can, within a week.

[*The witness was directed to furnish the same.*]

Veneris, 30° *die Maii*, 1823.

Sir ROBERT SHAW, BARONET,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Isaac Stewart, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

CAN you give any information to the Committee respecting the hay-market of Dublin?—Yes, I can.

From whence do you derive your knowledge upon that subject?—From the most respectable among the hay-factors.

Will you have the goodness to mention the name or names of the hay-factors on whose information you principally rely?—Money, Dodd, and some others.

Then

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

Then the Committee are to understand, that your knowledge is all derived from the information of others, and not from yourself being concerned in the trade?—My knowledge of the hay-market is not as a seller, but as a buyer.

A buyer for your own consumption?—Yes.

Then so far as your personal knowledge goes, every inhabitant in the city of Dublin that keeps a horse has the same opportunity of knowing it that you have?—Yes, they would, if they had taken the same pains that I have taken to get information.

Then the superiority of your information over that of other persons purchasing hay for their own use, arises entirely from the inquiries you have made, and the information you have got from the hay-factors?—Yes, and occasionally going there myself.

Do you know how hay was sold some time back?—Yes; the hay came to market formerly in loads, made up at 4¼ hundred weight each.

How is it sold now?—It is sold in loads of different weights.

They are upon cars, loaded according to the fancy of the owner?—Yes.

Do you conceive that that change has had any effect upon the average price of hay sold in the hay-market of Dublin?—I dare say it would; I am inclined to think it would.

Has it already had any effect?—Yes, I think it has.

What has that effect been?—To some inconsiderable extent; it has had some effect in enhancing the charge.

What effect has it had upon the price of hay?—I cannot say the precise amount.

Has it been to lower it, or raise it?—To raise it.

You think the price of hay is higher now than it was when the loads were four hundred weight and a quarter each?—I think it is; and my reason for thinking so is this, because the charges upon the article are now greater than they were, the farmer is therefore obliged to sell at a greater price, in order to have the same sum of money that he formerly had.

Then as a buyer of hay yourself, in point of fact have you purchased hay at a dearer or cheaper rate since the change?—I have not, in my recollection, the exact price that I paid before, and that I pay now.

Then if you cannot tell whether you pay higher or lower, how is it possible for you to know whether the price of hay has been raised or lowered by the change?—I cannot say of my own knowledge that the price is higher or lower now than it was before, but I consider the price of hay would be lower now than it is if it was subject to less expense, as formerly.

You have said in a former answer that the present regulations have had the effect of raising the price; you now answer that you cannot say of your own knowledge that the charge is higher or lower than it formerly was; how do you reconcile those two answers; do you think they are perfectly consistent?—I do, on these grounds, that the increase of charge creates an increase of price; and if it was subject to less charge, it would be sold for a less sum of money than it is sold for; and therefore if it was subject to less charges than it is, that it would be sold for less money; and therefore the additional charge that the farmer is now obliged to pay is laid upon the price of hay.

Then do you think that the change has had the effect of bringing hay into Dublin market from a greater distance than it formerly came?—I do not know as to that.

When instead of one horse drawing one load he draws three, four, or five loads, do you think the charge is calculated to save horse and cart-hire in bringing loads to market?—No doubt of it.

If one horse and car now brings as much as three horses and cars formerly brought, must not the necessary effect be to save two horses out of every three that come to market?—No doubt of it.

What is the usual value set upon a horse and car for a day in Dublin?—I do not know; horses and cars are not generally hired by the day; but are paid at fixed rates for the work they do; I believe the average value of horse and car-labour in the county of Dublin for a day; is about 3*s.* 6*d.* I have myself paid as high as 4*s.*

Then in point of fact, upon the carriage of thirteen hundred weight of hay, there is a saving in point of carriage of 7*s.* to 8*s.* upon the load?—According to that calculation, however, a different kind of car and harness is used to carry the present load.

In point of fact, is not the hire of all horses and cars the same, without reference to the description of horse?—I think a very indifferent horse would not be able to

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(30 May.)

do the work of a good one. I have an opportunity of knowing the different prices of horses and cars in the county of Dublin; I have employed them to work by the day, and if a horse is a bad one, it would not be employed at the same price, or would not be employed at all, in all probability.

What was the rate of charge of factorage upon selling hay according to the old mode?—I am not acquainted with it.

What is the rate of factorage upon the new mode?—I cannot tell that.

Then, whether there has been an increase or diminution in the rate of factorage you cannot tell?—I am inclined to think there is no difference; I fancy the charge is by the hundred weight.

What is the charge made upon weighing hay, according to the present method?—At present it is a halfpenny per hundred weight, but when it was first established by Alderman Beresford it was only a farthing a hundred weight; it has been lately doubled, and this is one of the complaints that the citizens of Dublin have to make, which I wish to mention to the Committee; the increase of this charge is one of the causes of the complaints of the citizens of Dublin, because the Lord Mayor, or the officers under the sanction of the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of Dublin, have exercised the power of increasing the charge. Alderman Beresford established but one weigh-house, and appointed but one weigh-master, and now there are either two or three; there is both an increase of the number of weigh-masters, and an increased price for weighing, and they exercise the authority to prevent any other person holding any other market within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor, and therefore the farmers frequenting the Dublin market are obliged not only to sell in that market, but to submit to the price, whatever that may be, which they think proper to charge. There is a charge also for weighing the empty carts, and ascertaining the tare; that is also a half-penny per hundred weight; they also charge 2*s.* 6*d.* for branding the number on the side of the cart, this practice has opened the way to the commission of a variety of frauds in the delivery of hay on the part of those farmers; such of them as are not very correct, or very honest, can send in their carts when dry, with light wheels, and have them tared in that state, and then when they come to be delivering hay again upon the carts with those numbers, they can, if they think proper, put heavier wheels and axletrees to the carts, and heavier wood of every description, and when such is practised the buyer is defrauded of the difference.

You stated the charge for weighing the tare is a halfpenny per hundred, do you mean to say that the car pays a halfpenny per hundred upon its own weight every time it goes into market?—Not unless they do not get the number branded upon the side; if they get the weight branded on the side, they do not pay every time, but if they do not get it branded, they have to pay it every time.

Is not the reason of that because unless the weight be branded it is necessary to have it weighed every time; but if the person chooses to have the weight branded it is not necessary to weigh it each time?—Yes.

You state that they have increased the number of weigh-masters?—Yes.

Do you conceive that any increased expense arises from the increased number of weigh-masters?—Yes, I do; when there was only one weigh-master there was only a farthing a hundred weight paid, and since that increase in the number of weigh-masters took place the increase of price has taken place.

Does the increase in the number of weigh-masters naturally occasion an increase of expense to the citizens of Dublin, unless there is an increase in the rate of charge?—Certainly not, if there is no increase of charge.

Does any increase of machines for weighing impose any additional expense on the citizens of Dublin?—I think if there was no additional charge of price the increase of machines could occasion no additional expense.

Then in point of fact the increase of weigh-masters, and the increase of machines, if not attended with any increase of charge, was a superior convenience and facility to the citizens of Dublin?—Assuredly.

You have stated the increased rate of charge is one halfpenny per hundred weight?—The charge since the commencement of the present method of weighing hay has been doubled; it commenced at a farthing and has been increased to a halfpenny.

What is the greatest number of hundreds that are usually carried upon each horse and cart?—I have had them from eight hundred to thirteen hundred.

Thirteen hundred, then, is generally the maximum?—I think it is as large as I recollect to have bought at any time.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

Then what is the expense, according to the increased charge, of weighing a car of thirteen hundred weight?—The increase is 3¼*d.*

The whole expense under the present mode is 6½*d.*?—That is the whole expense.

You have stated the saving upon the carriage alone to be 7*s.* to 8*s.* upon thirteen hundred weight of hay, according to the newly adopted method?—Yes.

Then if the increase of expense has been only 6½*d.* and the saving has been 7*s.* how do you support the position, that the change in the mode of selling has increased the price upon the consumer?—The change of system from bringing four hundred and a quarter weight to bringing thirteen hundred weight, is a saving in the manner of delivering, unquestionably; but in the manner of ascertaining the quantity, that is quite another consideration. This saving arose from the invention of a better description of cart, which rendered the change in system necessary; but had the change been to trusses of 56lbs. for hay, and 36 for straw, as in London, it would have had the best effect, and be of infinite benefit to both farmer and consumer, because the farmers could make up the trusses at their own houses, at their own expense, and not be obliged to pay any money out of their pockets. I admit that the carrying large quantities in the cart has been a great saving to the farmer; but I consider the frauds now practised upon the consumer by this method of ascertaining the quantity are very considerable; and whether those frauds practised by the present measures would amount to the difference, I am not precisely prepared to say; but I dare say it would make up a good deal of the difference.

You have already stated, that from the increased charges upon the farmer he is forced to ask an increased price for the hay?—Yes; that is, I mean the increase of expense from the difference between a farthing and a halfpenny.

Do those weigh-masters pay any sum annually to the Lord Mayor?—I am not prepared to answer whether the officers in Smithfield pay any sum for leave to exercise the right of being clerks of the market; but I am aware that the clerks of other markets pay money to the Lord Mayor for leave to exercise that right.

You never made any inquiries?—I did not, respecting those at the Haymarket.

Do you conceive that any advantage would arise to the public, if farmers were to bring their hay and straw in trusses, as is done in London?—Yes, I think there would be great advantage; and I am prepared to say, that in the Hay-market of London there is only 4*d.* charged for a cart; generally bringing in twenty hundred weight: that sum is for liberty to stand in the market, and receive a ticket; in Dublin it would be 10*d.* for the same load.

In point of fact, is there any charge made in Dublin for the standing of cars in Smithfield?—No, I believe not.

You mean, that if there was any charge in Dublin it would of course be tenpence instead of fourpence?—Yes.

Why are you of that opinion?—In London the farmers bring it in ready weighed; of course the charge is not for the weighing, but for the stallage. There is no charge for stallage in Dublin, but the charge is for the weighing; I mean that the hay-farmer in London has to pay fourpence upon twenty hundred weight; in Dublin the farmer has to pay tenpence for the same quantity.

Are you aware of the authority under which the different markets in Dublin are held?—I am not aware of the authority.

Are you aware that the corporation of Dublin claim the exclusive right, within the city of Dublin, of regulating and appointing the markets, and of preventing any person holding a market without their consent?—I understand they have exercised that power.

Are you aware under what authority they exercise that power?—I am not.

You have taken a good deal of pains to investigate every thing relating to the markets of Dublin?—I have.

Have you ever heard of certain patents under which those markets are held?—I have not.

Have you heard, and do you believe, that the right to hold those markets is vested in the Corporation of Dublin by various charters, particularly by the charter of Charles the 2d?—I have not seen the charter of Charles the 2d; I have read that part of the charters that are in Lucas's Book, and those were all I had access to, and I do not find any authority given in those charters to hinder any individual from opening a market.

Do you think that if there was a power given to other individuals to appoint

Mr. *Isaac Stewart.*

(30 May.)

markets in other parts of the city of Dublin there are not individuals that would exercise that right if they could?—Certainly

Then in point of fact there are no other markets but those appointed by the Lord Mayor and Corporation?—There are markets held in the city of Dublin which the Lord Mayor and the Corporation have no influence over.

Which are they?—The Corn Market and Kevens-street.

Do you mean to say that the Lord Mayor and the Corporation have no authority over the Corn Market?—Not inside the Corn Exchange.

The Corn Market, as it was held in Thomas-street?—While the Corn Market was held in Thomas-street the Lord Mayor had the authority over it; but since it has been removed to the Corn Exchange the Lord Mayor has no authority as to the opening, the closing, and the managing of the Corn Exchange.

Has he any authority over the weighing of the corn sold at the Corn Exchange?—None, that I know of.

If corn be sold by false weight in the Corn Exchange, has the Lord Mayor and Corporation no power or control over that false weight?—Any magistrate in the city has the power over that; it is punishable by a particular Act of Parliament.

Who are the magistrates of the city of Dublin?—The police magistrates in the city of Dublin. Any police magistrate has power over frauds practised in the sale of corn; and two county magistrates are capable of making a decision; but one city magistrate can determine upon a case of fraud in sale of corn.

Are you aware, that by any patent the Guild of Merchants have a right to appoint corn-meters as well as coal-meters, if they thought proper to exercise it?—I am not aware of that.

The non-interference of the Corporation of Dublin in the Corn Exchange is in consequence of a particular Act of Parliament?—It is.

But when not controlled by a particular Act of Parliament, under their patent, they have a general superintendence over all markets within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor?—I do not believe that in the Act of Parliament under which the Corn Exchange was erected, any notice was taken of the weighing and measuring of corn. I have been in the corn-trade upwards of twenty years, and I never knew the Guild of Merchants, or any branch of the Corporation, exercising any authority, in either weighing or measuring corn, except occasionally at the old market-house, where farmers, who had brought in sacks of corn that were not made up in even barrels, and there were scales wherein they might weigh if they thought proper.

How are the weights and measures of Dublin regulated?—The weights of Dublin are stamped by the clerks of the market.

Of what materials are the weights generally composed?—Of cast-metal.

Are they cast to the exact weight, or is it necessary afterwards to regulate them by any other means?—Yes; they are sometimes cast to the exact weight, and occasionally they are not to the exact weight. Those that make new weights for sale generally make them correct themselves before they send them to be stamped by the clerks of the market, because they charge different prices for stamping weights that are correct, than upon those that are not correct; that is, if they have either to add to or take from. I will read to the Committee the rates of charge made by the clerks of the market for stamping; it is, 4*d.* for every 56 lbs. or 28 lbs. weight; 3*d.* for every 14 lbs., and 2*d.* each for all smaller weights; and if adjusted with cutting off or adding to, the charge is 1*s.* 3*d.* for every 56 lbs., 10*d.* for every 28 lbs., 8*d.* for every 14 lbs., and 6*d.* for every 7 lbs., and 4*d.* for all smaller weights. I will also beg leave to read the charge in London for the same duty. The cost of stamping a 56 lbs. weight in London is 2*d.*

What is the cost of adjusting it?—I have stated the comparative charge, supposing it correct; and on all downward to 1*l.*, 6*d.* per dozen, and under 1*l.*, 3*d.* per dozen. I have not got any statement of charge in the event of a weight being to be adjusted in London.

If the metal weight be above statute weight is it not a very laborious process filing it down?—It is not a very laborious process cutting off the lead; and I am rather inclined to think they do not adjust metal weights that are over the weight, and requiring part of the metal to be filed off.

If it is to be done it is a laborious process?—Yes.

And entitled at least to some additional reward?—Certainly.

If it is under weight is not the difference filled up by lead?—Certainly.

If it is to be increased, it is increased by pouring in lead?—Certainly.

What

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

What is the value of the lead per pound so poured in?—About 4*d.*

Then if they are obliged to pour in two or three pounds of lead, they actually lose by the increase of charge?—Certainly; but if I were to answer that question, I am rather inclined to think if the weight took so much lead they would charge for the price of the lead.

Have you ever known that to be the case?—No; but I should surmise from the price they charge when they do not require lead, if they put in two or three pounds they would charge for it, exclusive of the charge for stamping.

You are in trade?—Yes.

You have seen a great number of stamped weights?—I rather think, upon recollection, that they do charge for the lead; I think I have paid them for the lead myself.

Who are the officers appointed to perform the duty of marking and adjusting weights?—There are now four clerks of the market, last year there were only three; each of them pay about 13*l.* to every new Lord Mayor for the right of exercising the power and authority of a clerk of the market; this information I received on making inquiry at the clerk of the markets as to those rates; two of those clerks were present, I asked them their names, one of them called himself Evans, and the other Moss; they informed me not only of the rates charged, but of the circumstance of their paying 13*l.* to every new Lord Mayor; this is also a matter of complaint of the citizens that the Lord Mayor should increase the number of clerks of the markets at discretion, for the purpose of increasing his own revenue; he has also, it appears, exercised the power of permitting them to raise the rates of charge, and has increased the number of officers; thus gone on and going on to an extent that induces the citizens to call for Parliamentary interference.

If in point of fact you should be mistaken in your information of any sum being paid to the Lord Mayor, do you think all your reasoning would fall to the ground?—Certainly.

What reason have you, besides the information of those clerks of the market, to say that they pay a sum to the Lord Mayor?—I cannot say that I have any particular reason. I did not apprehend that it was necessary to go farther than to get those mens words for the sum of money they paid, and that those clerks of the market did not feel satisfied with the conduct of the Lord Mayor; and the reason they assigned was this, that their situation was not a very lucrative one, when there were three of them having all the profits and emoluments to be divided into three shares.

Do you believe now that there is any thing paid to the Lord Mayors?—I do believe that it was the case with the last Lord Mayor; and I do believe that it was the case with more Lord Mayors. I believe it has been done frequently; that it has been paid even of late years.

You do not believe it was paid to all the Lord Mayors?—I do not believe now that it was paid when Sir Robert Shaw was Lord Mayor, because he has just said he did not receive any. I think they also said the secretary had part of this; they did not say how much of this money each Lord Mayor had; but how it was appropriated I cannot say.

Has there been any increase in the fees of the clerks of the market?—I am not prepared to answer that question; but I am inclined to think they have been increased from what I have paid myself since I commenced business. I cannot positively state it, but as far as my memory serves me, I am inclined to think some of those fees are increased; I think I have heard other people make the same remark also.

How are the measures regulated in Dublin?—The fee charged in Dublin is 13*d.* for fixing the city seal on all measures.

What are the measures generally used in Dublin?—A variety; the same as in any other place; there are all kinds.

Bushels and pecks?—Yes; naggins and half naggins.

Do you mean to say that the naggins and half naggins used in the shops generally have the city seal on them?—No; I do not suppose they have all the city seal on them; but I apprehend they are liable to be seized if they have not.

If they happen to be full measure, though not sealed, are they liable to be seized?—I apprehend they are.

Do you know by what law they are liable to be seized?—I do not know of any law to that effect.

In

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

In point of fact, have you ever heard of any quart, or pint, or any measure which contained the legal capacity, being seized for want of the city stamp being upon it?—I have heard of their being threatened to be seized; but whether really they were seized, I do not know.

You have heard many threatened to be seized upon the supposition of being short in measure?—Yes; not threatened, but actually seized; and they have threatened to seize my weights that had not the city stamp upon them.

Have they ever done it?—They have not.

Did you stamp them in consequence?—I think I did.

Have you any now not stamped?—I think they are all stamped.

In point of fact, you never had a weight seized in consequence of not being stamped?—No.

Have you ever known a person have a weight seized in consequence of its not being stamped?—Not of my own knowledge. With respect to the stamping of the measures, with the permission of the Committee, I will state what is charged in London for the performance of the same duty.

[*The witness delivered in a statement, which was read as follows:*]

Rate of Charge for affixing the City Seal to Weights and Measures in the City of London.

Beer Measure.

For gallon, half-gallon, quart, pint, and half-pint, one farthing each.

Wine Measure.

For five, four, three and two gallons, twopence per gallon; half a gallon, twopence; one gallon, fourpence; a quart, one penny; pint, one halfpenny; half-quartern, quartern, and half-pint, one farthing each.

Rates for Charge of affixing the Seal to Weights and Measures at Guildhall, Westminster.

Beer Measures.

The same as in the city of London.

Wine Measures.

Five to one gallon, twopence per gallon; quart and pint, one halfpenny; and all smaller measures one farthing each.

Weights.

Fifty-six pounds, twopence; all under down to one pound, sixpence per dozen; and under one pound, threepence per dozen.

While I was getting this information yesterday, I found the men were stamping very large quantities.

But in point of fact, is it the practice in Dublin to stamp any measures used in the public-houses?—I think it ought to be; and I think the reason why it is not is the very excessive charge made for stamping.

If the clerks of the market have the power of enforcing the stamping of the measures in Dublin, do not you think they would be very anxious to avail themselves of the power of doing it?—I am inclined to think they have the power, and I also think they ought to exercise it.

Do you think they have abstained from doing so?—I think the resistance of the people, in consequence of the greatness of the charge, has induced them to abandon it.

In point of fact, if every measure used in the city of Dublin were to be stamped at the London rate of charge, would not the clerks of the market receive more than they do now?—I cannot form a comparison of what are stamped, and what are not in Dublin.

What is the smallest measure that is usually stamped in Dublin?—I suppose half a naggin.

Is there any provision made by the law in respect to the potato-market held in Dublin?—I believe there is an Act of Parliament on the subject.

What is the Act?—There is an Act of Parliament on the subject, requiring the Lord Mayor of the city of Dublin to provide beams, scales and weights, and weigh the potatoes free of any charge.

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

Have you been able to discover that Act?—I have not; but I recollect having read an extract from it somewhere, that to secure to the poor consumers and the growers of this necessary article of food, it has been provided by law that the Lord Mayor shall provide a beam and scale, and shall weigh all potatoes coming to the market free of any charge whatsoever.

Have you ever seen that Act?—I have not.

Have you ever looked for that Act?—I have.

Have you ever made inquiries for that Act?—I have.

Did you ever ascertain the year of the reign in which it was passed?—Yes, I did ascertain in a book which I have read, but I could not find that book in London; it was a pamphlet written by Counsellor Finlay, and the Act is mentioned in that pamphlet.

What is the custom or stallage paid at present upon potatoes?—It is 2 *d.* on sacks of three hundred weight, and I believe above that weight it is 3 *d.*

In point of fact, what is the usual quantity in each sack of potatoes?—I believe it is under three hundred weight: they are usually in barrels of 2 cwt. 2qrs. 14 lb. I am informed the charge on potatoes is not for weighing, or granting a ticket of the weight, but for the stallage or use of the ground whereon the market is held.

Has there not been a potato-market lately erected in the city of Dublin?—I believe not; it is held in an open space, called the Little Green.

In point of fact, at the present moment, are they allowed to be sold outside that market?—I cannot answer that question. With respect to the ground which has been lately inclosed, being part of the Little Green, it was in my memory an open space; it appeared to me to belong to the public, as an open thoroughfare. I believe part of this ground is now inclosed, and probably potatoes may be sold both inside and outside this place.

Are you of opinion that the Little Green is not the estate of the city of Dublin?—I am not aware of that; I know Newgate and the sheriff's prison are erected on the ground called the Little Green, in Green-street, but I am not aware that the whole of the ground round Newgate is the estate of the city of Dublin.

Are you aware in whose Mayoralty that potato-market was established?—I am not.

Are you aware of the regulations at present existing with respect to the right of stallage, and the management and support of that market?—I am not; I have already mentioned the names of the officers connected with the potatoe, the fowl, and fruit-market, all those articles are sold in the same neighbourhood; the chief part of the ground whereon those markets are held belong to a man of the name of Halpen, whereon a distillery once stood.

Are you aware whether Halpen held that under a lease from the city of Dublin, and that his lease expired?—I am not; but I have been informed by Halpen that he had at one time an interest in that market; but how or when it was transferred from him I am not prepared to say.

What alterations or improvements would you suggest in the management of the potatoe and fruit-market of Dublin?—I consider the weighing of potatoes at the Little Green could be very well done for a great deal less money than is at present charged and paid.

Is there any charge made?—I consider it the same thing whether it is paid in the shape of stallage, or as a charge for weighing; it amounts to the same thing.

Are you aware that before that market was established the sacks stood in the public street?—I certainly must say, that since that encroachment has been made in the ground I have not been in the habit of attending the market, but I know there was a considerable space, affording room enough for the people to sell and exercise the privilege that they formerly had enjoyed.

What do you mean by the encroachment?—I mean inclosing ground that was formerly free for the public.

Do you think that a man inclosing his own estate is an encroachment?—Certainly not.

Have you any doubt that that ground belongs to the Corporation?—I have very considerable doubts.

Why have you?—Because it was open to the public for at least fifteen years within my memory.

Do you mean to say that not inclosing ground divests the owner of his title to it?—Certainly not.

What

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

What alterations or improvements can you suggest in the management of the potatoe and fowl-market?—With respect to the potato-market I consider, as I have said before, it could be done at much less expense; and there is another complaint, namely, the charges made in the egg, fowl, and fruit-market; the fees and emoluments charged being considered excessive, much more than is necessary for the purpose of affording public convenience.

What are they?—I have described them already; the charge under 3 cwt. is 2*d.* and above 3 cwt. is 3*d.*

In point of fact, did you ever know 3 cwt. in one sack?—Yes.

Are they not generally two hundred and a half in one sack?—I think they are; it may be fit to explain that. Those fees collected in the markets from the sellers do not go to increase the property of the city, as they ought, so as to render the city more capable of paying its debts, or supporting its own dignity and consequence; they are diverted to individuals whom the Corporation appoint; and the city funds are therefore distributed to individuals who have influence enough to get situations. If those situations were open to competition, with the fees attached to them, the city might derive a very considerable sum from that source; I dare say about 2,000 *l.* per annum.

What are the situations that you would set up to public auction?—I mean the markets which have been just described, provided the fees that are now charged in them were legal, and that they have a right to levy them, were individuals afforded an opportunity of bidding for, they would be a source of very considerable revenue.

Bidding for the situation of clerks of the market?—I mean the power of levying those charges; if the person in possession had the power of levying those charges, it would be a source of considerable revenue.

What are the situations that you think ought to be set up to public competition?—The situations of clerks of the market.

Then you would set them up to the persons that would undertake the business at the lowest sum?—I say they would be a source of considerable revenue to the city if they were set up to public bidding, and present fees guaranteed.

To the highest or the lowest bidder?—The highest bidder, certainly. The potato, egg, fowl, and fruit, and butter-markets at Little Green, bring in from 1,300 *l.* to 1,400 *l.* a year; the butter-market about 3,000 *l.*; hide-crane about 700 *l.*; oyster and herring-boats about 300 *l.*; hay and straw about 800 *l.*, making together 6,100 *l.* per annum.

Have the Corporation of Dublin derived any thing from them?—Nothing, that I know of, except what I have already described.

Have not those markets been leased to different individuals?—I believe not by the Corporation.

Who could lease them but the Corporation?—The greater part of the ground on which the egg, fruit, fowl and potato-markets are held, was Halpen's I understand that a Mr. Clark and Alderman West claim a right to this ground; that they got leave to open a market there; but I do not believe they paid the Corporation any sum whatever for leave to open that market.

Have you any statement to make respecting the butter-market?—There were formerly three export butter-cranes in the city, and three inspectors; at which time the trade was conducted in a most discreditable way, arising from a competition between them, that is, between the three craners and the three inspectors. Upon an application of the merchants, about five or six years ago, the three craners agreed to consolidate the whole business of the city into one crane, they agreeing among themselves to divide the profit. All the merchants obtained by this alteration was to confine the inspection to one individual. The Lord Mayor, however, would not relinquish his patronage of appointing and keeping up three craners in the city, although one would do the business as well or better than three. The merchants have frequently applied to the Lord Mayor to discontinue two of the craners. I have attended several deputations to him on the subject. Upon the occasion of the death of one of those craners, the Council of the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants applied to the Lord Mayor not to fill up the vacancy, but he refused to accede to their request, although it served no other purpose than making a provision for the individual, who is a carpenter and builder, and following his trade as usual. There is a sum provided by law to be levied upon all butter coming in from the port of Dublin, by the act of the 52d of George the 3d, c. 104, and it amounts to 3*d.* for

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

for craners fees, inspecting and cooperage. I will read to the Committee the report of the Council of the Chamber of Commerce upon the subject: "Of your Council's transactions, those relating to the butter-crane of this city serve distinctly to indicate the necessity of such measures as shall supersede the system on which our butter-trade has hitherto been conducted, by one more suitable to the importance, and better fitted to promote the prosperity of the trade. That the establishment on an independent basis, and under legislative sanctions, of a commercial crane, governed by wholesome regulations, and efficiently directed, forms the essential corrective to the evils by which this great branch of national industry has been hitherto depressed, is an opinion entertained by all who are practically acquainted with the trade, and sincerely interested for its improvement.

Your Council's interference with a view to this object has been suspended, under an impression that such an interference on the part of a chartered body, with a large available fund at its disposal, would be more consistent, and probably more effectual. They have accordingly bequeathed the matter to the care of their successors, by whom it will no doubt be taken up with the energy and perseverance necessary for its accomplishment.

In the mean time your Council have endeavoured to effect the subordinate reformations of which the existing system appeared susceptible.

Their strenuous recommendation to consolidate the several cranes of the city into one establishment, although unsuccessful when offered, has since been adopted, and with a result fully justifying the stress laid upon the measure; your Council's endeavours have been also employed to obtain a reduction in the excessive and illegal charges of the crane under the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor and Corporation. These charges have been found to operate with peculiar severity, at a period when the state of commerce generally, and of this branch in particular, renders the most rigid economy indispensable, while they have had a direct tendency to alienate a considerable part of the butter-trade from the capital to the rival and less expensive out-ports.

A deputation from the Council waited on the Lord Mayor, and a public meeting was consequently convened, at which the undue charges of the crane were explicitly set forth. It was represented, that whereas the Act of Parliament for regulating the butter-trade allows, in consideration of great expense and trouble for weighing and branding every cask of butter, 2*d.*; and for tasting, proving, and marking the quality, 1*d.*; for the performance of those duties, 7*d.* is actually levied, exclusive of a charge of 4*d.* per cask for cooperage, indiscriminately exacted on good and bad casks, and for casks very inefficiently done. Crane cooperage may possibly improve a bad cask, but it is sure to injure a good one. The charge for cooperage ought to depend upon the condition of the cask; but levied without distinction, it virtually operates as an encouragement to the use of bad casks, and thus, doubtless, has contributed to banish Irish butter (but particularly that from Dublin) from the foreign markets, to which it formerly had access, for in this branch of the trade especially it is obvious that the quality of the cask is a matter of the first importance. At the meeting in question, the practices complained of were admitted; the infraction of the Act of Parliament was admitted; and an exercise of official authority, such as might correct the abuses, by enforcing a compliance with legislative regulations, was promised, but there is reason to apprehend that to the present moment no step whatever has been taken for the purpose.

The facts thus stated cannot fail to facilitate the measures necessary for removing the evils which they so strongly exemplify."—

You have given in a printed paper to the Committee on the subject of the charges on the importation of coals?—I have.

By whom was that printed paper prepared?—It was prepared by me.

Are the Committee to understand that you have taken pains to ascertain the truth of all the sums charged in that printed paper?—I have taken pains to ascertain it.

Do you believe that every thing contained in it is true?—No; there is an error I have already explained in my former examination, it is an overcharge in point of the quantity of coal.

Is that the only error?—That is the only error that I am aware of at present.

Is the sum of 181,089*l.* to be supposed to be the extra charges, and the unfair charges, to which the city of Dublin is liable on the importation of coals?—Not all unfair; some of them are very proper and correct, and some of them I consider are not correct.

Do

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

Do you mean to say that that 181,089*l.* is what the citizens of Dublin pay for their coal above any other city importing the same quantity?—Yes, above any city importing the same quantity, and not liable to the same description of charges.

Are those charges upon the consumers of coal in Dublin to which the inhabitants of other cities are not liable?—They are charges that the city of Dublin is liable to, that Manchester or Glasgow is not liable to, or any inland town in England.

The first item in this paper is 6*d.* a ton upon a certain number of tons of coals; that is the error that you allude to; the sum there mentioned is 6,686 *l.* 15 *s.* how much ought that to be?—I cannot say; but I know the quantity of tons has been over-rated.

What do you mean by artful measurers?—I mean the man in the hold of the vessel who fills the tubs.

In point of fact, from whom do they receive that 6*d.* per ton?—If the ship was consigned to me I would have to pay one half, and the captain the other half.

Besides the coal-meters?—Yes.

To whom would you pay it?—To the man in the hold of the vessel who fills the tubs.

To the crew of the vessel?—No; the crew are not bound to do it.

You state that the sum paid for that amounts to 6,686*l.* 15*s.*?—Yes.

In point of fact, is there any right in any human being to demand that sum?—No right, unless they are employed to do the work.

If you do not choose to employ them to do the work, need you do it?—If a person is employed to do that work, without making any particular agreement as to the price of his labour, he will be entitled to receive the 6*d.* a ton.

Is that the name by which they go?—They are called measurers of coals, but there are not a great many porters on the quay that are completely up to that science.

Is the meaning of the term, artful measurer, a man that has the knack of making a small quantity of coal fill a larger measure?—Yes.

Then the Committee are to understand from you, that the consumer pays that man for diminishing the quantity which he himself is to receive?—The seller pays it, and the consumer pays the seller.

Then the consumer pays those artful measurers for diminishing the quantity of coals purchased by himself?—It is the seller that pays it; it therefore is an increase of the first cost of the article.

Then the seller bribes a person to measure falsely?—I do not say there is any thing wrong in paying the sum that the Lord Mayor and the magistrates would award to them.

Do you mean to say that the Lord Mayor or the magistrates would ever award that sum?—I do mean to say, that if he is employed they would enforce the payment of 6*d.* a ton, provided he made no particular agreement with him as to price; it is the act of the owner of the ship, and it is the customary price that they receive.

Then there is a good deal of skill shown by different measurers in defrauding the public in the measurement of coals?—There is a good deal of skill in the measuring of coals. I will not call it defrauding the public, because it is the custom of Dublin.

May not a custom be a fraudulent one in point of fact, if it is by skill to make a small quantity of coal fill a larger measure; do not you call that a fraud on the consumer?—I should say, if a smaller quantity be artfully put into the measure than ought to be, it is a fraudulent practice.

How is that fraud to be best prevented?—By delivering coals by weight instead of by measure.

Are you of opinion that delivering coals by weight would be an advantage to the consumer?—I am. I have been asked respecting the rates charged in the fruit-market. I will deliver in a paper containing the rates.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:*]

The charge (exclusive of stands or stallage) rated on fruit is as follows:

	d.
Raspberries per dozen of noggins - - -	1
Baskets of currants, cherries, strawberries, or gooseberries - -	1
Kish of ditto - - -	5
Hand-basket of small fruit - - - -	1½
Small clive of ditto - - - - - - - - -	1

Mr. Isaac Stewart.

(30 May.)

Second size	1½
Third, ditto	2
Kish of apples	2
Car load of ditto	6
Small basket of nuts	1
Clive of ditto	3
Ditto of wall-fruit or hothouse fruit	2
For every article not herein enumerated	1

It was formerly sold at coal-quay in the open street, free of any charge. The Lord Mayor removed the people from this place by force.

There is a printed board put up in the market with those fees marked on it, and said to be by 47 Geo. 3d, but I cannot find in the statutes any such Act."

You stated that fruit was formerly sold in the open street, and the sellers were removed from thence by the Lord Mayor?—They were; I recollect their being removed.

Are you aware that the people selling fruit on the quay was any annoyance to the citizens of Dublin?—I am not aware of that; but they obstructed the passage at certain times of the year. When there were crowded large markets, they obstructed the passage in some degree; but for my own part I never considered it any inconvenience.

Are you aware that the Lord Mayor removed them at the special application of the benchers of the Society of King's Inn, who were obstructed in going into Court?—I am not.

Are you aware that frequent complaints used to be made, both by the military guard and the benchers of King's Inn, of the nuisance of exposing this quantity of fruit for sale in the open streets?—No. I beg to correct a mistake in a statement which I made in a former part of my evidence, into which I was led by the writer of a letter which I hold in my hand. He now writes to me, in order to correct his previous information. I mentioned that Mr. Oulton received fees from the measuring of coals, and I find in that respect I was not quite correct: he receives fees, but not as a measurer.

Sabbati, 31° die Maii, 1823.

THOMAS SPRING RICE, ESQUIRE, IN THE CHAIR.

Thomas Spring Rice, Esq. the Chairman of the Committee, Examined.

T. S. Rice, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

HAVE you taken any pains to inform yourself of the state of the different Gaols in Ireland?—I have taken pains to investigate the present state of the gaols in the province of Munster, and have been for many years concerned in the management and the internal arrangements of the prison of the county of Limerick.

Has there been a new gaol lately erected in the county of Limerick?—There has.

Have you been much concerned in the arrangements for that building, and the consequent arrangement of prisoners and classification of prisoners in it?—I was one of those who originally introduced the subject to the notice of the grand jury; and after an inquiry of above a year, and communication with all the best authorities, both professional and of other descriptions, in this part of the united kingdom, we adopted a plan, economical in its execution, and perfectly calculated to carry all the present provisions of the law into full effect; that has been built, and has been occupied, between two and three years; and the result has been satisfactory to those concerned in the management of the prison, and as we hope highly conducive to the public interest.

You had an opportunity of investigating the evils which existed under the old system?—We had.

Can you shortly state the most prominent of them?—In the former prison of the county of Limerick, which had been built within a few years, but which had been built in utter defiance of all the regulations of law, there was an entire absence of classification; the accommodation for prisoners was infinitely less than the necessity of

T. S. Rice,
Esq.
a Member.

(31 May.)

of the case required, and the expense of maintaining prisoners in gaol never amounted to less than five-pence a day, and yet they were extremely ill supplied; a constant system of commutation of food took place for spirituous and fermented liquors; illegal fees were constantly taken; and the whole system was one of maladministration and of wasteful expenditure.

Are you satisfied, that all those defects have been remedied in the arrangement of the new gaol?—I conceive that all the defects to which I have alluded, have been remedied in the new prison; and the expense of maintaining the prisoners under the improved system, has been very little more than one half of what it cost the public to maintain them under the old objectionable system of administration.

Are you aware what the average number of prisoners confined in the Limerick gaol may be?—During the year 1822, the total number of persons committed, amounted to 753; the total number of persons acquitted by the verdict of a jury, 317; no bills found against 39; no prosecution of 216; and those bailed, and not tried, amounted to 14. The average number of prisoners daily within the prison, amounting to 135.

Can you ascertain what the expense per diem per man in the gaol of Limerick is, including all the necessary supplies of food, clothing, &c. for each person?—I am not enabled to give a full answer to that question, but I can inform the Committee what the expense of maintaining the prisoners in food has amounted to; it has been, within the year, 573 *l.* 9 *s.* 6½ *d.* which would give an average of a little more than 2½ *d.* a day each; the former expense, under the old system, having been always 5 *d.*

What is the description of dietary established in the prison?—The dietary established in the county of Limerick prison, is the following: For breakfast, oatmeal porridge, or as it is called stir-about, and new milk; for dinner, potatoes and sour milk. All the rations are cooked in one common kitchen, and delivered out regularly to all the persons entitled to receive them, and without the establishment of a central kitchen and the delivery of rations so prepared, I conceive it next to impossible to introduce a due system of economy in the supplies of food, or a proper system of internal discipline within the gaol, it being obvious, that if you allow the prisoners to cook for themselves, it is next to impossible to limit them, as to hours and times, so as to enable them to apply themselves to labour of any kind, with the regularity and precision which is necessary.

Was there any introduction of animal food in your dietary?—Animal food is introduced in the hospitals, under medical directions only; and I shall be able to inform the Committee what the hospital expenses have been in themselves.

Do the prisoners all retain a vigorous state of health under that system of dietary?—The most perfect; the average number of hospital prisoners never having exceeded three out of 135.

Then you are satisfied that with this dietary, introducing animal food for the description of prisoners generally confined in Irish gaols, is not necessary?—I consider it not only unnecessary but objectionable, because I should think it is the first duty of those who manage prisons to take care that those who are committed for offences should not be, in any respect, better provided within the prison than they would be by their own industry out of doors; and the limit of diet which we have always kept in view was, never to exceed the amount or quality of diet which was actually necessary to keep the prisoners in full health.

Are you aware what the expense of the hospital establishment in the gaol of Limerick is?—The expense of the hospital diet and medicines for the year to which I have alluded, amounted only to 36 *l.* 17 *s.* 5½ *d.*; and it may be right to inform the Committee how this economy in medicines has been produced; the former expenses for medicines having infinitely exceeded the sum which I have now stated, under the former regulations, we procured all our supplies of medicines from a retail apothecary, and the bills amounted to very considerable sums, both on account of medicines, and on account of the necessaries which the apothecary undertook to furnish; we found that there was no sufficient check upon the apothecary's account by this system, for the only check which is provided by law is by reference to the Apothecaries Hall, which, from a remote county, and from other circumstances appeared to us scarcely sufficient to counteract the augmentation of expense; we therefore, under the new act, laid in a supply of necessary medicines for ourselves, and have paid a small sum to the apothecary of the neighbouring hospital to compound them, and the result has been such as I have stated to the Committee, *T. S. Rice, Esq.* a Member. (31 May.)

namely, a very great reduction of the expense to which the county has been subjected.

Have you a regular physician attached to the hospital establishment in the county of Limerick?—The medical establishment has appeared to me always disproportioned to the necessity of the case; we have a physician and a surgeon; and I am perfectly convinced, that the duty would be as well administered by one medical officer only, namely, by the resident apothecary of the neighbouring hospital, whom we employ to compound the medicines, but having found those appointments already made, the superintending committee had some difficulty in dealing with the subject.

What is the salary allowed to the physician?—It was 50*l.* for the physician, and 50*l.* for the surgeon, and their duties at that period were precisely the same as they now are, and no difficulty was found in procuring the attendance of sufficient officers at those salaries; but the grand jury, of their own accord, thought it advisable to double the emoluments of both officers, and they now amount to the sum of 100*l.* or guineas, I forget which; to each, but by the new Act, which is in progress in Parliament, the whole of the medical expenses will be reduced to 80*l.* a year, which I am convinced will be amply sufficient to pay for the attendance, and to procure the medicines necessary for the prison hospital.

All the evidence you have hitherto given applies to the county of Limerick prison, not to the city?—Yes.

Has any arrangement been made in the city of Limerick, for procuring a new gaol?—There have been improvements carried on to a considerable extent in the city of Limerick prison, but from the mistaken notion of endeavouring to reform a bad gaol in place of building a new and good one, the improvements which have taken place have been ineffectual, and there cannot be a worse managed prison than the city of Limerick prison was when I last visited it.

You have spoken of the system of checking the expenses of medicines by reference to Apothecaries Hall; do not you conceive that it is a principle vicious in itself, that one apothecary should be appointed by law to tax the bills of another?—I have no manner of doubt of it; I am quite convinced that that check is a nominal one only.

Have you in conjunction with the other gentlemen, prepared an annual report of the county of Limerick prison?—An annual Report has been prepared, not by me, but by a very intelligent gentleman, with whom I have had the honour to act on the superintending committee.

What has been the extent of attention bestowed by the committee to the affairs of that gaol?—Nothing could have been more unremitting and active than the performance of their duties by the superintending committee; and I have no hesitation in saying, that it is impossible to hope for any real reform in the internal discipline of a prison, or any economical administration of the establishment, so long as you merely trust to paid officers, without introducing the superior mild control of a superintending committee of gentlemen, appointed by the grand jury, and pledged by character as well as by engagement, to the discharge of the trust which they have undertaken to fulfil.

Such gentlemen have been easily found in the county of Limerick?—We have had no difficulty in filling up the number of our superintending committee, nor of procuring their attendance: and from what I have reason to know has occurred in the county of Cork, the same facility has there been found, and the same beneficial consequences have been derived from the establishment of a superintending committee for that county prison.

Then the Committee are to understand that it is your decided opinion, that a great portion of the benefits derived from the gaol establishment of Limerick, is in consequence of the superintendence of an unpaid committee?—Not only a great part, but the whole; I am convinced that the intire expenditure of public money, to which the county has been subject, would have been utterly useless; so far as the future administration of the gaol was concerned, and that the efforts of grand juries and paid officers would have been defeated in every branch of their operation, had it not been for the efforts and superintendence of an unpaid committee.

You spoke of a Report having been prepared by the superintending committee; do you happen to have a copy of that report?—Yes, I have.

Will you have the goodness to hand it in to the Committee?—

[*It was delivered in and read, as follows:*]

"REPORT

"REPORT of the Committee of Limerick Gaol, dated May 1823.

Report on Limerick County Gaol, delivered in.

(31 May.)

"THE county of Limerick gaol began in the year 1817, was occupied in February 1822. It is built upon what is called the windmill plan, having five wings with a centre building, containing the governor's house, chapel and infirmary, covered by a flat roof, on which the convalescents take the air; each of the five buildings is divided longitudinally into two separate wards; and each of those ten wards having its yard, pump and privy. There are from twelve to fourteen cells, and one day room to each ward, the whole accommodation afforded being 125 cells and 10 day rooms, besides five solitary cells, each with its separate yard; the walls of the yards are fourteen feet high, and there is a spacious insulated area, surrounded by a wall twenty-two feet high; within this passage and near the entrance lodge, are the public kitchen, the laundry, baths, turnkeys and matron's apartments and clerk's office; opposite to these and within the area, it is intended to erect a stepping mill for grinding corn and dressing flour, and another for scutching flax; water is at present, distributed all through the prison, and raised to the top of the centre building, by means of two forcing pumps, worked by stepping wheels and requiring four persons each as the moving power; the governor's garden and a small bleach yard occupy another portion of the area. The ten wards are allotted as follows: No. 1, debtors master's side; No. 2, debtors commons side; No. 3, males charged with capital felonies and under minor charge, if previously convicted of any felonious offence; No. 4, males charged with simple felonies; No. 5, males misdemenants, first class; No. 6, ditto, second class not before committed, and boys, No. 7, male convicts of felony; No. 8, male convicts of misdemeanor; No. 9, males under rule of bail revenue cases, and boys under sentence; No. 10, females; female debtors in a detached cell; the average number of females in the county prison seldom exceeding four in the year, it is in contemplation to divide their ward into two, and to make strong cells for condemned culprits at the inner side. The establishment of this gaol consists of a governor, at the salary of 300 *l.* a year; a clerk and store keeper at 40 *l.*; first turnkey, 35 *l.*; two other turnkeys, 30 *l.* each; matron, 30 *l.*; nurse, 25 *l.*; physician, 50 *l.*; surgeon, 50 *l.*; apothecary and inspector, 45 *l.* the same individual filling the two offices; chaplains, protestant and Roman catholic, 50 *l.* each; schoolmaster, 40 *l.* There are ten wardsmen and two cooks, taken from amongst the prisoners; and most of the washing is done by women under confinement.

"There is a board of superintendence appointed under the 1st and 2d of George the 4th, chapter 57, who have framed a code of regulations for the prison, and meet weekly to inspect it; the regulations have been chiefly adopted from those of the prison discipline society of England, and the rules of Maidstone gaol, with such variations as local circumstances appeared to require: the dietary consists of two meals per day, the breakfast seven ounces of groats made into three pints of very thick gruel or stir-about, and one pint of new milk for each person; for dinner each person is allowed three pounds and half of potatoes and one pint of sour milk, the cost of both meals is less than three-pence. The prisoners under long sentence of confinement are clothed completely, and all requiring linen or other articles of dress are provided with them; each prisoner sleeps in a separate cell, unless when the gaol is unusually full, upon an iron bedstead, furnished with a bedtick filled with straw, a pair of sheets and two or three blankets, according to the season; prayers are read every morning after roll called in chapel, by the catholic chaplain, or person appointed by him; the school master attends each ward every second day, giving two or three hours to each for instruction and reading approved works, and there is a small library in the gaol from which the prisoners are supplied with books suited to their description and wants. No sufficient system of hard labour has yet been introduced into this gaol, but all prisoners condemned to labour, and as many others as are required, are kept to raising water, breaking stones, and such work as is found necessary in a new prison, so as to fill up most of their time on those days when the school master does not visit their ward; a tread-mill will be erected this summer and a regular course of labour immediately established; by the 3d of George 4th, chapter 64, all prisoners receiving the county allowance of food are to be kept to work, one third of their earnings being allowed to them. The gaol has now been occupied little more than a year, a time too short to allow any accurate judgment to be formed of the regulations and practice adopted in it; it has, however, been ascertained that the cleanliness and regularity which prevails throughout the establishment, Report on Limerick County Gaol, delivered in.

(31 May.)

blishment, and the sobriety and orderly conduct which the prisoners are obliged to observe are extremely irksome to all persons of loose immoral habits, to those the labour, though as yet but slight, is also peculiarly disagreeable, and when the period of their imprisonment has been so short as to afford no opportunity of improvement or reformation arising from the system pursued in the gaol, it has been sufficient to cause a great deal of disgust and discontent, and a consequent resolution to avoid if possible a second committal; in many of those persons whose confinement has been longer, there has been a visible improvement in morals and conduct, common swearing and profane conversation have been laid aside, and books of a serious and devout tendency have been sought for with anxiety, and read or listened to with eager attention; the conduct of the prisoners of this class in chapel is serious and edifying, and the chaplain reports he has every reason to believe, that with many criminals of no light dye the foundation of a better life has been laid in the gaol; several on leaving the prison have gratefully acknowledged the benefits they derived from the discipline to which they have been subjected, and from the instructions received, and promised by their future lives and conduct to evince the reality of their amendment; some time must elapse before the sincerity of their declarations or the good effects of the systems of the gaol can be said to be fully proved, but it is consolitary to know, that as yet there has been no instance of a re-committal, and the board have been informed, through the catholic clergyman of a parish to which some persons of notoriously bad character have returned, after a period of confinement, that the greatest possible change has been observed in their manner and conduct, and that there is every reason to believe those persons are ashamed and afflicted at their past misdeeds and sincere and steady in their resolution to offend no more."

T. S. Rice, *Esq.* a Member.

(Mr. Rice.)—It may be right to state to the Committee, that, subsequent to the increase of salary of the physician and surgeon, to which I have already adverted, another grand jury have reduced the salary to 50*l.* a year each, which, even at the reduced sum, I consider to be more than the necessity of the case requires. It may be also material to mention, that the moral and religious instruction which takes place in the prison, is with the perfect concurrence and assistance of the Roman catholic clergyman; who, although he objected to any attempt being made to force the reading of the Scriptures upon any prisoners within the gaol, had no kind of objection to allow any person, who himself wished to read the Scriptures, to be furnished with the Testament.

In point of fact, are you aware whether any of the prisoners have applied for a Testament for the purposes of reading?—I rather think they have; I am quite sure that there are Testaments in the prisons; the Douay Testament, without note and comment; and a variety of other moral and religious works of the best tendency, and as we conceive of the best effects, have been recommended by Roman catholic clergymen to the superintending committee, and after being approved of by them, have been put into the hands of the prisoners of the gaol.

The appointment of all the officers of the gaol are by the superintending committee, are they not?—No; the appointment of the gaoler is in the hands of the sheriffs; and under the old system of administration, the greatest possible inconveniences were found to result from this system of appointment; the sub-sheriff considered the office of gaoler to be a matter of patronage which belonged to him; and I know of my own knowledge, that it has been more than once made a matter of sale; the superintending committee found very great difficulties in obtaining any power of interference without controling or limiting the responsibility of the sheriffs, and the following plan was devised, which has been found to answer extremely well: A considerable portion of the gaol has been appropriated by the grand jury as a house of correction, which appropriation, grand juries are by law authorized to make; they are competent to appoint an officer, as governor of the house of correction; and all their presentments to the gaol they make contingent upon the appointment of the keeper of the house of correction taking place as a gaoler by the sheriff; and as the county require security, both in money and in character, we apprehended, and we have found that the security which was good for the county, would also be good for the sheriff; by adhering to this principle we have in point of fact, made the gaoler a permanent, in place of being an annual officer, and we have had no reason to imagine that any inconvenience has arisen to the sheriff, from his acquiescence in the regulations which we recommended to him.

In

T. S. Rice, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

In the event of your having a refractory sheriff, how would you be able to reconcile the system established with the responsibility of the sheriff in cases of debt?—If the sheriff refused to act upon our principles, he would then appoint his own gaoler; but he would in that case have to pay him, which in itself, gives the public some security; that the course which has been adverted to, will not be pursued by any sheriff, as it is one of additional burden to him, without any advantage resulting from his declining to act under our suggestion.

Who has the present appointment of the turnkeys and subaltern officers of the gaol?—The turnkeys and subordinate officers are appointed by the governor of the prison, subject to the approbation of the board of superintendence; but every officer's salary, from the highest to the lowest, is made contingent upon his performance of his duties, and there is a power by his appointment vested in the board of superintendence, if they shall so think fit, in cases of delinquency, to strike off any portion of the salary.

Who are the wardsmen appointed by?—They are selected in like manner from amongst the prisoners themselves, and they are entitled to rather better allowances, and somewhat of pecuniary encouragement; the appointment of wardsmen from amongst the prisoners themselves, we have found conducive to the best consequences, as it affords us an opportunitiy of encouraging and rewarding those, who by their good conduct, appear deserving of support and countenance.

In point of fact, does the governor give security to the county or to the sheriff, for the security of all the prisoners committed to his care?—To both.

Have there been any escapes from the new gaol—There have been escapes; when the prison was first occupied, the architecture was not complete, and there were ladders and modes of passing up the walls from the unfinished state of the buildings, which enabled some criminals to escape; there have been some subsequent escapes even after the architectural arrrangements were complete, which we had reason to attribute to the corruption of one of the turnkeys, who was immediately dismissed.

Have you any means to ascertain the profits arising from the labour of the criminals in that gaol?—No, I have not; but those profits are in themseves limited. The internal work of the prison, whitewashing, cooking, washing, every occupation of that nature, is performed by the prisoners; and those who are not convicted are entitled to a greater proportion of their earnings, and I have known an individual receiving between one and two pounds upon his discharge, which, in my mind, was highly important to the public interest, as it precluded the necessity of his being cast back upon his evil courses, upon his discharge from prison.

To what purposes have the profits of that labour, whatever they may be, been applied?—Whatever profits have taken place upon the labour, are of course carried to the credit of the county.

In estimating the expense of the prisoners per day, did you mean that was the expense of the county after crediting the county with the produce of their labour, or that it was the gross amount of the expenses attending their food?—It was the gross amount of the expenses attending their food.

Of course, then, that is to be diminished by the amount of the produce of their labour?—Yes; but as yet, the profits of labour have been extremely small, for we have not as yet been able to establish our wheat and flax mill, from whence we anticipate a considerable benefit in the consequent considerable reduction of the county charge; at present, the mills which we employ, are merely for raising water for the purposes of the prison itself, a matter of importance, both as it relates to the interior cleanliness and the employment of the prisoners, but one which, in itself, produces no profit.

Does it appear to you to be a plan likely to be productive of profit, the extensive introduction of manufactures?—I do not think the introduction of manufactures, in a county circumstanced like ours, could be attended with any considerable advantage; first, because the people are indisposed to manufacture; and next, that very few of the agricultural prisoners are acquainted, practically, with any manufacture, and there must be, consequently, a considerable waste of time and materials before their labour could be made profitable.

Do you not apprehend that it may likewise have a prejudicial influence upon the manufactures out of the gaol, by reducing the price of their manufacturing labour, in a county where there is a scarcity of demand already?—To a small extent it must, but I conceive, that consideration to be immaterial, because it would be equally

applicable

T. S. Rice, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

applicable to any mode of employment; we employ our prisoners in breaking stones; that diminishes the demand for labour of that description out of doors; but the paramount necessity of employing prisoners in gaols is so great, that I do not think the little difference of the competition which is thus produced ought to be regarded.

What may the expense of building that gaol be?—I think the expense of building the gaol and the purchase of the site, amounted to about 24,000*l.*

What is the number of criminals for which it is calculated?—It contains 125 cells and 10 day rooms, besides five solitary cells.

How many could it hold without incroaching upon the rules of discipline of the prison?—The rules of discipline of the prison would require to have a separate cell for every prisoner, which would hold about 130; but with regard to the building of any gaol, I should very much recommend any public bodies who are about to embark in it, to look at the experience of practical men conversant with the internal management of prisons, much more than to the recommendations of professional architects: our plan was submitted to the late Sir George Paul, to Mr. Morton Pitt, of Dorchester, to Mr. Harenc, who has taken a great share in the management of the Maidstone gaol; and I am quite convinced, that without the practical information derived from them, we never could have adopted a plan that would have been beneficial to the public: I need only point out to the Committee the inconveniences arising from following mere architectural authorities, as exemplified in the original building of the Richmond bridewell, in the city of Dublin, which was utterly unfit for the purposes of a prison, although it had cost the public a very considerable sum.

You have examined the Dublin prisons?—I have, but not for some years.

Can you entertain any reasonable doubt of the impossibility of an arrangement of prison discipline in the city of Dublin, without a new Newgate being provided?—I think it completely impossible, unless Newgate were merely made use of for one particular class of prisoners, who might then be accommodated.

Do you conceive the building of a new Newgate for Dublin to be an object of sufficient importance to justify the necessary expense?—I conceive the building of a new criminal prison in Dublin is absolutely necessary for the purposes of criminal justice in that city, not only as it concerns the administration of that gaol, but as it concerns the reaction on society; the state of Newgate, when I visited it, being infinitely more caculated as a seminary for crime, than as a place for the punishment of offenders: a new prison for debtors is also particularly wanting; the whole arrangements for debtors both in the sheriff's prison, the city marshalsea, and the four courts marshalsea, being utterly defective.

Do not you conceive, that an uniform plan for gaols throughout Ireland would be most desirable?—Unquestionably; and I can state to the Committee, that from want of some general principle upon the subject, great waste of public money has frequently taken place in the prison of the county of Clare at Ennis, and in the prison of the county of Kerry at Tralee, there has been an expenditure of public money, which ought to have procured for those counties, gaols of the best description; but from want of due care in the choice of a plan, the prisons are so bad, that I conceive them to be incapable of improvement, and necessarily involving, at a period, more or less remote, the building of a new prison altogether.

Might not the adoption of a fixed plan, from which no deviation could take place, have the effect of preventing the possible improvements of ingenuity in future?—It certainly might; but when I consider that the main principles of gaol architecture which are at the present day adopted in all improved prisons, are the very plans which, between the years 1780 and 1790, were recommended by Howard and his architect Mr. Blackburn, I am not very sanguine as to any extensive improvements, as far as the principle goes.

Would not that very objection to a fixed plan be remedied, if a power were vested in the Lord Lieutenant, upon being satisfied of the projected improvement, to cause it to be adopted?—By the law as it now stands, no gaol can be undertaken without the approbation of the Lord Lieutenant; but I have reason to know, that although those plans are subjected to the inspection of the most able and conscientious officers, the inspection is rather one of an architectural nature, than bearing at all upon the internal discipline or economy of theprison.

Then as the law stands at present, if the government of the country choose it, they may insist on an uniformity of plan, without any legislative enactment for that specific purpose?—Having the power of refusing their approbation, they may in fact carry any plan which they think fit into effect.

T. S. Rice, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

Do not you conceive, that a general fixed plan throughout Ireland, would tend to public economy?—I have no doubt of it.

Have you a copy of the rules and regulations of the Limerick prison?—I have.

Will you have the kindness to hand it into the Committee.

[*The witness delivered in the same (vide Appendix).*]

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member of the Committee, Examined.

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member.

HOW long have you been acquainted with the city of Dublin?—I have been acquainted with it a great number of years; but have interfered in its internal concerns for the last four or five years.

Are you possessed of landed property in the city of Dublin?—I am.

Are you a freeman of the city of Dublin?—I am.

Have you ever served upon any of the grand juries in the city of Dublin?—I never have.

Is there any thing in the constitution of those grand juries which precludes you from serving?—Nothing in the constitution which precludes me; but it has not been the general habit, nor under all circumstances could I have attended had I been summoned.

To what general habit do you allude?—The habit of confining the grand jury, in a great measure, to the corporation of Dublin.

Who are the individuals whom you designate as the corporation?—Aldermen, sheriffs peers, and common councilmen.

How many does that body consist of?—Altogether about 160.

Are the grand juries of the city of Dublin taken generally, if not exclusively, from a body consisting of about 160 only?—They are; there are a few exceptions, but they are so few, as not to infringe a general conclusion of that sort.

By the adoption of this general rule, are not many persons of rank, station, and property, and character, excluded from those grand juries?—Of course a great number of them are: at the same time they are not so numerous as people in general would suppose; for this reason, that the great bulk of the city of Dublin is not freehold but leasehold interest for terms of years, and the number of people of respectability is much greater than the number of freeholders comparatively speaking, the houses being held for terms of years; I am quite satisfied that the number of freeholders, who from their rank and station would be qualified to serve on the grand juries of the city of Dublin, is much more limited than is generally supposed, which fact is proved from the circumstance of the registered freeholders at the last election not amounting to more than 200.

Is there any law, either municipal or general, which has led to this limitation of persons?—None, that I know of; it has been merely the practice, and not law.

Do you conceive it a practice which is advantageous to the public interest?—I, certainly, as far as my own opinion goes, would recommend the grand juries to be selected more from the citizens at large; I am sure it would remove grounds of suspicion at least, whether well founded or otherwise, and would reconcile persons to the grand jury system, that are at present discontented with it.

Do you not conceive it essential, that persons interested in the presentments themselves should be as much as possible prevented from being members of the grand jury?—I am quite sure they should; at the same time, that all through Ireland the system has been too much of persons on the grand jury presenting money to themselves.

But you have never known, in any county grand jury, instances of individuals who are interested in the supply of stationery or any articles of that kind, being members of the grand jury?—No, I never have; but it is a notorious and constant practice, on all grand juries, for persons to present monies to themselves for carrying on roads and things of that sort, in which they have at least as much private interest as in any contract; the system generally is erroneous, but not confined to any county in Ireland.

In those cases of county presentments to which you refer, the individual who is to account for the expenditure is not the individual who receives the presentment?—I believe in a great majority of instances, particularly in the south of Ireland, the money is accounted for by the tenant, but actually received by the landlord.

The individual who accounts must be the person named in the presentment?—He must.

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

Is not the introduction of the name of the grand juror therefore more as a guarantee and recommendation, than for any other purpose?—As far as my experience in the counties goes, and from having gone circuits for a number of years, and having been frequently upon grand juries myself, I am rather inclined to think, that the name of the grand juror being introduced into the presentment, is for the purpose of enabling him to receive the money without its going into the hand of the actual contractor.

Do not you conceive that is an abuse?—I do; a most capital abuse.

Do you not conceive, that the appointment of public officers, whose salaries are presented by the grand juries, and whom the grand jury are bound to support in the execution of their official duties, but who are connected with the grand jurors themselves, is also an abuse?—I am clearly of opinion that if the grand jury be accessible to any undue motive, it is more likely to be exercised in favour of a relative than a stranger.

Even withont imputing any undue motive, do you not think that such a system goes to deprive the grand jury of a considerable share of the public confidence?—I am quite sure it has had that effect in the city of Dublin, whether justly or not.

Are you acquainted with the constitution of the county of Dublin grand juries?—I am, without ever having served upon one of them; though I have property in the county I was never summoned.

They are appointed by the county sheriffs, and taken from the individuals possessed of large property and high qualifications, are they not?—Taken from the freeholders of the county, but in a great measure limited to the same persons; there is not a greater variety on the county grand jury than on the city grand jury; about fifty persons in each, will perhaps be found to supply the grand juries for the last ten or fifteen years.

But those fifty persons are persons recommended by their station and rank in the county, and not by any peculiar qualification, such as that in the city of Dublin?—Certainly, nothing but their property and their wish to be on it; but there are a certain number of men in the county, who wish to be on the grand juries, without any motive that I know of that will implicate the propriety of the choice.

Do you conceive, that if a contract were advertized for by the county of Dublin grand jury, and by the city of Dublin grand jury, there would be as open competition for the one as the other?—I really am not apprized of any circumstance that could make a difference; for though I am of opinion that the constitution of the Dublin grand jury is unpopular with a certain description of persons in Dublin; I am not sure that there is any facility afforded for fair competition, more by the one grand jury than the other; and I never heard, till I heard it from the witnesses before this Committee, that there really existed that great suspicion of the grand jury in the city of Dublin, that prevented persons from proposing for contracts.

If for a considerable number of years, the greater proportion of the contractors with any grand jury, have been immediate friends and connexions of the grand jurors themselves, do you not think that such a practice is likely to deprive a grand jury of the full confidence of the public?—It may have that effect; at the same time if it had that effect, it may have it without any just imputation upon the grand jury.

Are you aware, whether in point of fact, many of the contractors and persons receiving salaries from the grand jury, are the immediate connections of the grand jurors themselves?—Whether the contractors are, or not, I have no doubt a number of the officers employed, are connections of those persons serving on the grand juries; it is a natural consequence when the situations are elective, that they should elect those persons with whom they are connected.

Has there been any variation in the practice of the city of Dublin sheriffs, with regard to the constitution of the presenting grand jury, since the report of this Committee of last year?—I am not aware of any; but I am quite convinced in my own mind, that a recommendation coming from this Committee, unconnected with any thing of personal imputation, or any imputation of misconduct, would have the effect of producing the alteration required.

The Committee of last year having expressed a hope, that, in practice, a remedy may be afforded to this evil, produced by an improper application of a principle in the selection of grand juries, unsupported by the law of the land, and contrary to the best interests of the public; and that recommendation not having been attended to, how do you hope that the recommendation of this Committee would be more effective?—

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

effective?—The recommendation of the last Committee was not attended to, because from communications I have had with persons who are best able to carry it into effect, I am persuaded they felt that recommendation to be so much connected with imputation on themselves, that acceding to the recommendation, they felt would be acquiescing in the justice of the suspicions entertained; my evidence was, that a recommendation from this Committee, unaccompanied by any imputation, either personal or general, would be attended with the desired effect; and I have no doubt it would.

Can you point out, in the report of last session, any imputation of an injurious nature?—At this moment I have not the report exactly on my memory; but whether it does contain such imputation, or not, I am quite sure that the persons to whom I have alluded, acted under the impression that it did so; whether that was well founded or not, I cannot at this moment from my memory supply.

Do you consider the principle and practice, which has been adopted by the sheriffs of the city of Dublin, to be supported by the law of the land?—It is a subject, upon which the law itself is silent; the law gives a discretion to the sheriff, which I should for my own part be glad to see more liberally exercised towards those, not members of the corporation.

Do you conceive, that this selection of grand jurors from the corporation only, is beneficial to the interests of the public?—I am quite satisfied it is not beneficial, inasmuch as it excites suspicion; for I am quite satisfied of this, that in their general conduct, they are as correct and as pure as any other grand jury in the kingdom of Ireland.

Do you conceive the contract system, as at present administered by the grand jury, to be administered on principles conducive to proper economy, and the fair competition, which ought to be the objects of a system of open contract?—I am quite sure that the contract system pursued by the grand jury of the city of Dublin, is as little liable to any objection as any other I have ever known; there are some objections to it, but their objections which the grand jury cannot remedy, but which arise from the law itself; for instance, I am quite sure that it is quite wrong, that the grand jury should be obliged to take the lowest offer, however high that may be; and I will only add, that in the course of a very minute investigation, from persons of all political principles, and principally from those who are most hostile to the grand jury of the city of Dublin, I have never been able to trace one single authentic instance of any offer made by any person, being the lowest, not being accepted.

Have you ever heard of an alteration in the contract, being in point of fact introduced, by a difference in the article supplied, and the article contracted for?—In point of fact, that is a chance to which every contract is liable; but I believe the Dublin grand jury have taken as much pains, and as effective means to check that, as any grand jury I have ever known.

The execution of the contract system being gone, requiring daily attention in the supplies of food and clothing for prisoners, do you not think that the establishment of a superintending committee by the grand juries for the prisons, would have the effect of insuring a fair supply by the contractors?—I am sure it is the most likely means of having the supply equal to the sample; and in point of fact, whether justified by law or not, the city of Dublin grand jury have instituted a check of that description, by appointing a certain number of the grand jurors to act in the capacity of a superintending committee, during the time they are not sitting.

Is that committee composed of members of the grand jury alone?—I believe exclusively selected from the grand jury, and I believe it is generally by ballot; it is a duty which the people in general do not like, and I believe the selection is made by ballot.

Do you not think, that a superintending committee appointed by the grand jury, and consisting not only of grand jurors, but of any other active and benevolent persons whom the grand jury might think fit to appoint, would be a better mode of administering the economy of the prisons, than a committee of the grand jury themselves?—I think it would be better to appoint persons not on the grand jury; but as it is at present constituted, the grand jury cannot exercise any influence except over their own body.

The grand jurors are generally persons in business, or who hold other situations?—They are generally persons engaged in commercial pursuits.

From that very circumstance many of them must have conflicting duties, which interfere

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

interfere with the due discharge of their duties as a superintending committee over the prisoners or the contracts?—Of course, people that have any other pursuits in private life, have all of them more or less to do.

Several of them are police magistrates?—Police magistrates are frequently on the grand jury.

Do you not conceive, that if a permanent superintending committee, so constituted, were authorized to receive tenders for contracts, and to report those tenders for contracts to the grand jury for their determination, that it would be a better principle than leaving the whole to the grand jury themselves?—So far as it might remove suspicion, I think it would; but in point of practical result, I am sure the present plan enjoys every advantage that that would, except that it is liable to certain general suspicions which may influence particular individuals; under the present system the tenders are sent to the secretary before the grand jury are named or sworn, and they are by him laid before the grand jury, and from that moment no other contract is received.

Having stated that under the present system of contracts, by which the grand jury are forced to accept of the lowest tenders, it has happened that the grand jury has been forced to contract at a higher rate than the market price, does it not strike you that there must be something wrong in the contract system?—I cannot attribute the want of bidders, under the present system, to any fault in the system, but to some accidental cause; in the case which has been referred to, there were but two offers, and the grand jury refused to accept of either of them till compelled by the judge. In that case, I happen to know that the bad quality of the potatoes was detected by the inspector, and the grand jury availed themselves of that, to supply the prisons at a much lower price; the contractor has not to this hour received one farthing on account of what he did deliver, inasmuch as the inspector refused to certify his accounts.

It having been stated in evidence to this Committee, that at the time the lowest tender made to the grand jury for potatoes was at 6 *l.* a ton, that the market price in Dublin at that period was under 4 *l.* must there not have been something defective in the system of receiving tenders, which led to such a result?—I cannot conceive any possible cause existing in the system of receiving proposals; and as I said before, I believe that to have been purely accidental.

You have stated, that two proposals were made for that article; are you aware how many proposals have been, at any one time, received for the supply of any one article?—I never, personally, have; but they are all read in open court before any contract is approved of; whether they consist of one, two, or twenty, they are laid before the judge upon oath.

Do you conceive that the King's Bench can exercise more than a formal control over matters of such intricacy and detail, as the internal management of the prisons and the supply of contracts?—The management of the prisons is entirely beyond their functions; the supply of contracts, in themselves, include no intricacy; in point of fact, I do not believe the King's Bench would minutely examine those contracts, unless their attention was called to it; but when it is open to all the citizens of Dublin to call their attention to it, I feel that the court are quite justified, when their attention is not particularly called to it, in not minutely examining into it.

There is no power of objecting, in the way of traverse, to any contract?—None.

Do you not conceive that it would be an improvement in the law, as it now stands, if the remedy by traverse which is afforded to presentments, should also be extended to contracts?—I feel it would be impossible; for while it was contesting, the different supplies would be totally wanting to the prisoners; for instance, the contract for bread; while the traverse was being tried, the prisoners might starve.

Is not the trial of a traverse, in the instance of the county presentments, immediate?—No, not till the next sittings.

If the law required all contracts to be laid before the court in the commencement of the term, and then admitted a traverse, in case of any imputed or alleged unfairness in the contract, do not you think that that would afford a check to the present contract system?—In point of fact, I do believe it is done so.

If there were a traverse triable at once, and going to the fairness or unfairness of the contract, do you not think that it would afford an advantageous check to the contract system?—I think it would; but in any system of that sort the law must be altered, so that it should not be imperative on the grand jury to take the lowest offer, however high that may be

Thomas Ellis, Esq. a Member.

(31 May.)

You do not mean to suggest that there should be any discretion left to the grand jury to take a higher offer than the lowest?—Certainly not.

Can you give the Committee any information as to the offices of town clerks and clerks of the peace?—The profits of the two offices are about 1,900*l.*

Do you mean to state, that the whole emoluments of the town clerk and clerk of the peace, do not exceed the sum you have stated?—No, I am sure they do not.

Whence do the emoluments of the town clerk arise?—The town clerk acts as clerk of the crown in Dublin, and they are held by the same persons, and the duty is carried on in the same office; I am very nearly certain, that the presentments for them in the city of Dublin last year, did not exceed 1,900 *l.*

Are there not other emoluments?—There are no other emoluments, except in case of gratuities on an election; and in point of fact, from the number of persons committed, and the number of trials that took place before the recorder, I think they are under paid; for in the course of last year they had to take proceedings in the performance of their office in preparing indictments; that if they had been paid according to the established rate which the taxing officer would tax them, as regular proceedings in law courts, they would have been entitled to nine times the sums; there were above nineteen hundred indictments prepared by them, and if that had been taxed according to the established fees of an attorney for a similar duty, would have been entitled to 13 *s.* 4 *d.* for the drawing, 13 *s.* 4 *d.* for the engrossing, and 2 *s.* for the parchment.

Are there not fees paid for the trials before the recorder?—Yes, there are, and presented for; but they are all included in that sum of 1,900 *l.* that includes all their fees and emoluments for all their labour of every kind, and I think it is an under-paid office.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

RETURNS to Orders from the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Local Taxation of the City of Dublin, respectively dated the 19th of March, the 14th of April, the 8th and the 15th of May 1823;—*for*

N° 1.—Accounts showing the last Year's Account of each Department and Parish of Dublin, which collects Taxes in that City - - - - - - - p. 255
N° 2.—Account of the Fee called "Chapter and Guild," levied on all Vessels cleared from the Port of Dublin, for 20 years, ending 24th December 1822 - - - - - - p. 265
N° 3.—Account of the amount of Taxes on Job Carriages, on Cars, Carts, Sedan Chairs, Stall-keepers, Pawnbrokers, and Spirit Retailers, contributed to the Watch and Police Establishment of Dublin, during each of the last seven years - - - - - - ibid.
N° 4.—Return of the Salaries and Emoluments of the Keepers of the several Prisons in Dublin, specifying the sources from whence their emoluments arise, for the last eight years, distinguishing each year - - - - - - - - - - - p. 266
N° 5.—Accounts from the Commissioners for Paving the Streets of Dublin, of Money due from the Corporation; of Salaries paid during the last seven years; of retired Allowances; of Miles of Streets and Roads under the management of the Paving Board; of Prices paid for Materials; and of Prices paid for Day labourers - - - - - - - p. 267
N° 6.—Reply to Charges preferred by Mr. Peter Finnerty, storekeeper and superintendent of Artificers to the Paving Board, against Sir Eyre Coote, one of the Commissioners p. 278
N° 7.—Letter from the Right honourable Henry Goulburn to Sir Charles Coote, Bart. dated Dublin Castle, 31st October 1822 - - - - - - - - - p. 283
N° 8.—Letter from the Right honourable Henry Goulburn to Commissioners of Paving, dated Dublin Castle, 6th November 1822 - - - - - - - - - ibid.
N° 9.—Account of all Sums paid by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Paving Board; and the Arrears of Composition now remaining due from the Corporation - p. 284
N° 10.—Account of the Amount of Royal Exchange, for the year 1822 - - - ibid.
N° 11.—Account of the Salaries and Emoluments of the Officers and Servants of the General Penitentiary at Milbank - - - - - - - - - - p. 285
N° 12.—Account of the Expenses for Medical attendance at Newgate, Giltspur-street, and Borough Compter, for one year - - - - - - - - - - p. 286
N° 13.—Return of the Number of Prisoners committed to the Cold-bath-fields Prison, during the last year, and of the Surgeon's salary - - - - - - - - ibid.
N° 14.—Account of the Medical Expenses of the General Penitentiary at Milbank, 1822 ibid.
N° 15.—Returns from the Convict Establishment in the Hulks - - - - - - p. 287
N° 16.—Account of the Medical Expenses of the Prison at Horsemonger-lane, during the last year - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ibid.
N° 17.—Paper respecting the Cork local Act, which compels the sale of Coal by weight p. 288
N° 18.—Account of all Sums of Money collected by the Corporation of Dublin, under the 49th Geo. 3d. on account of Metal Main Pipes, for the year 1822;—also, An Account of all Sums of Money collected for Pipewater Tax, during 1822; and, An Account of the Funded Debt of the Corporation for laying down Metal Pipes - - - - ibid.
N° 19.—Account of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipewater and Metal Main Establishments, for seven years; 1815—1822 - - - - - - - - p. 290
N° 20.—Letter from Inspector General of Prisons in Ireland to the Chairman of the Committee, enclosing Plan for Reduction of Expenditure in the Medical Department of the Dublin Prisons - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 294
N° 21.—Statement of the Amount paid by the Collector of "Carts and Cars Rent," to the Receiver of the Police Establishment, for the years 1820, 1821, 1822; distinguishing the Amount paid on each description yearly - - - - - - - - - p. 295
N° 22.—Return of the Amount received for Cart and Car Licences from the year 1815 until 1823 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ibid.
N° 23.—Grant of James the Second, re-incorporating the City of Dublin - - - p. 296
N° 24.—Grant of Charles the Second; the Mayor of Dublin to have a Cap of Maintenance, &c. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 311
N° 25.—Grant unto the Lord Mayor of Dublin, &c to have a Foot Company - - p. 312
N° 26.—Grant of a Ferry to the City of Dublin - - - - - - - - - p. 313
N° 27.—Grant of Release of Quit Rents unto the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, and Commonalty, &c. of the City of Dublin; dated 21st November, 18 Charles 2. - - - - p. 314
N° 28.—Grant unto the Mayor, Sheriffs, Commons, and Citizens of the City of Dublin - p. 316
N° 29.—King's Letter, granting Five hundred pounds per annum unto the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, &c. of the City of Dublin - - - - - - - - - - - p. 318
N° 30.—Grant of Customs to the Lord Mayor, Commons, and Citizens of the City of Dublin p. 319

APPENDIX.

Appendix, N° 1.

ACCOUNTS from the under-mentioned Departments and Parishes of Dublin; *viz.*

Departments of,—Wide Streets, Ballast Board, Foundling Hospital, Paving Board, Police.

Parishes of,—St. Anne, St. Audeon, St. Catharine, St. Bridget, St. James, St. Luke, St. Mark, St. Mary, St. Michael, St. Nicholas without, St. Nicholas within, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, St. Werburgh, St. Thomas, St. George, St. Andrew.

WIDE STREETS, DUBLIN.

ACCOUNT of Wide Street Grand Jury Tax, for one Year; from Michaelmas Term 1821 to Michaelmas Term 1822.

	Solvent Arrear from preceding year.	Applotment, or Sums payable.		TOTAL.
City of Dublin - - -	£.821. 6. 9½.	£.7,770. 10. 11½.	- - -	£.8,591. 17. 9.
County of Dublin - - -	—	—	—	—

	Sums received.	Solvent Arrear.	Insolvent Arrear.	TOTAL.
City of Dublin - - -	£.4,742. 9. 1.	£.635. 8. 6.	£.3,214. 0. 2.	£.8,591. 17. 9.
County of Dublin - - -	790. 1. 0½.	—	—	—

The County Collectors, who are appointed by the Grand Jury, not having as yet returned Particulars, no other Account than as above can now be returned.

ACCOUNT of Wide Street House Card Tax, for the Year due and ended 25th March 1822.

Arrear from 25th March 1821.	Tax to 25th March 1822.	Total Due.	Sum received.	Tax remitted.	Arrear outstanding, including Insolvencies.
£.957. 12. 3.	£.894. 13. 11½.	£.1,852. 6. 2½.	£.741. 18. 11½.	£.33. 15. 5½.	£.1,076. 11. 9½.

ACCOUNT of Wide Street Club Tax, for the Year 1822.

Received for 601 Members of Kildare Street Club, at £.1. 2. 9. each - - -	£.683. 12. 9.

Dublin,
5th May 1823.

By Order,
Tho & *D. H. Sherrard*, Clerk.

BALLAST BOARD.

Sir, Ballast Office, Dublin, 5 May 1823.

IN compliance with the desire of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, as communicated in your letter of the 2d instant, and in conformity with the order of the Committee of the House of Commons, on Dublin Local Taxation, I have the honour to enclose two copies of an account stating the amount received from the inhabitants of the quays westward of Carlisle bridge, for the last year, ending 1st February 1823.

I have also the honour to enclose copy of a letter, dated 10th February 1802, addressed to this board by Alexander Marsden, Esq. secretary to the then Lord Lieutenant, with the reply of the corporation thereto, from which the committee requiring the account will perceive, that the trouble attendant upon the works then proposed, was not sought for by this corporation, but undertaken at the instance of Government, and the tax upon the inhabitants of the quays is the only remaining source, effectually to further and complete this work, and keep the same in repair, together with the proper cleansing of the river within the limits between Carlisle and Barrack bridges, the great advantage to arise therefrom, being chiefly enjoyed by the resident inhabitants of those quays.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
W. Gregory, Esq. Your most obedient humble servant,
&c. &c. &c. *John Corsart*, Sec.

Return of Wall Tax payable by the Inhabitants of the several Premises situated on the respective Quays between Carlisle Bridge East, to Barrack Bridge West, on the North side, and between the West end of Crampton Quay to Barrack Bridge, on the South side of the River Anna Liffey; per Act 43 Geo. 3. c. 127.

Total Quay Wall Tax collected for the last year, namely, from the 1st of February 1822 to the 1st of February 1823 - - -	£.879. 18. 2.

Being at the rate of 2 *s.* per foot on all premises in front to the river Liffey.

Note.—The 29 sect. of 43 Geo. 3. c. 127.—All persons who before the passing of Act, were bound to repair said walls, exonerated therefrom in consideration of annual payment of 2 *s.* per foot on their holdings.

Ballast Office, Dublin,
May 5, 1823.

William Bigger,
Ballast Master Port of Dublin.

My Lords and Gentlemen, Dublin Castle, 18 Feb. 1802.

A Representation having been laid before the Lord Lieutenant by the late term grand jury, by direction of the court of King's Bench, of the ruinous and dangerous state of the Quay walls from Carlisle-bridge to the Barrack bridge, on each side of the river Anna Liffey, excepting that part of the wall at Aston's quay, built under your direction; and having also stated the necessity of building new walls upon a general plan; and it appearing to his Excellency, from the fidelity and zeal with which you have conducted the works already committed to your care, and with which the works now proposed are connected, that the same could best be carried into execution under your direction, he desired that a bill should be prepared for extending your powers in respect to the walls of the river Liffey.

And I have now the honour to send you herewith, by his Excellency's command, a draught of a bill for the purpose before-mentioned, and he requests you will immediately take it into your consideration; and that you will favour me with your observation and opinion thereupon, for his Excellency's information, as soon as may be convenient.

I have the honour to be, &c. &c. &c.
A. Marsden.

Sir, Ballast Office, Dublin, 4th March 1823.

In compliance with the desire of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, communicated by your letter of the 18th February, the corporation for preserving and improving the port of Dublin have, with all due diligence, taken into their consideration the draught of a bill proposed by his Excellency to be submitted to Parliament, for rebuilding the walls of the river Anna Liffey; and have made such alterations therein, as to them seem requisite for the effectual and secure attainment of that object.

If no other competent body can be found to undertake the superintendence of this work, which they ardently wish could be the case, the corporation, whose wish it is to further an object of such great public utility, will not decline to comply with his Excellency's desire, by taking the labour of it on themselves, notwithstanding that other heavy works, immediately connected with the purposes of their incorporation, press on them for execution.

The corporation beg leave to suggest, that a rate of about three shillings and sixpence per foot might be laid on the inhabitants of the quays, the remainder of the expense to be provided for by presentment (so far as that may be deemed prudent), or by such other aid as may be applicable to the purpose.

But I am directed to request, that you, Sir, will represent to his Excellency, the opinion of the corporation, that although the tax of five shillings and sixpence per foot and upwards, will be requisite for the purposes of the Act, yet that on a comparison of the proportionate advantages to be obtained by the inhabitants of the quays, and by the public at large, respectively, from the works to be executed, the sum proposed to be laid on the inhabitants, is considerably beyond what, in point of fairness, should be laid on them, and also beyond what can with ease, and without much ill temper, be collected.

The amended draught of a bill accompanies this letter, to which the corporation have taken the liberty of adding some clauses for the objects of their own incorporation, which they hope will not, and do not wish should, interfere with the passing of it.

I have the honour to be, &c.
To Alexander Marsden, Esq. *Richard Broughton.*
&c. &c.

FOUNDLING HOSPITAL.

A GENERAL STATEMENT of the Receipts and Payments of the Foundling Hospital in Dublin, for one Year, ending the 5th January 1823.

THE CHARGE.	£.	s.	d.
Balance on 5th January 1822	253	11	11¾
Grant from Parliament	32,500	–	–
☞ House tax	7,373	3	9
Rent of estate	104	10	–
Casual Receipts; *viz.*			
Sale of manufactured goods	180	15	3½
Fines from servants, &c.	1	19	9
Old paper sold	3	11	6
Received with children admitted	540	–	–
Renewal fines from some of the tenants	78	8	7
£.	41,036	–	10¼
THE DISCHARGE.			
Paid for provisions	3,991	18	10
— Clothing and manufactures	1,642	12	–½
— Coals	398	1	8
— Candles and soap	167	19	6
— Lamp oil	42	3	8
— Furniture, bedding, &c.	875	17	1
— Bibles, stationery, and advertising	283	3	–
— Medicine and infirmary expenses	32	7	10
— Poundage and expense attending the collection of tax	331	4	–
— Apprentice fees	1,520	–	–
— Miscellaneous expenses	75	2	5
— Salaries and wages	2,530	4	6½
— Annuities	108	6	8
— Repairs of buildings	57	18	–
— Law agent's bills of costs	88	12	3
— Parliamentary fees on the Dublin Foundling Hospital Act, sessions 1821 and 1822	429	10	5
— Wages for nursing children in the country	28,421	16	3
	40,996	18	2
Balance on 5th January 1823	39	2	8¼
£.	41,036	–	10¼

☞ The collection of the House Tax ceased after the 4th January 1823, pursuant to the Act passed last session of Parliament.

Given under our Corporation Seal,
at the Foundling Hospital, Dublin,
8th May 1823.

Robt Dudley Oliver,
Chairman.

PAVING BOARD.

AN ACCOUNT of the Amounts received and paid by the Commissioners for Paving, &c. the Streets of Dublin, for one Year, ending 5th January 1823.

	£.	s.	d.
(A.) Balance in Cash, 5 January 1822	2,616	5	8
Cash paid on account of several demands which were not finally closed on the 5th January 1822	2,299	11	2
RECEIVED, *viz.*			
Tax collected	29,729	16	9
Lighting globes at several places	422	1	–½
Scavenging soil sold	938	5	1
Fines for nuisances	52	9	4
Fines for globes broken	27	11	8
Paving over openings made in the streets by the Pipe Water Committee	843	10	–
Paving over openings made in the streets by the Dublin Gas Company	344	–	11
Paving over openings made in the streets by the Oil Gas Company	241	16	11½
Paving, flagging, and sewer work, done for several individuals	1,658	7	11
Watering the streets	1,366	7	5
Several incidental receipts	290	2	4
Composition payable by the Corporation of the City of Dublin for the pavement round St. Stephen's Green	100	–	–
£.	40,930	6	3

(A.)—The above balance in cash of £. 2,616. 5. 8. remained in hands to be applied towards paying the debts that remained due up to January 5th 1822, amounting to the sum of £. 5,659. 3. 10.

(continued.)

PAVING BOARD—*continued.*

	£.	s.	d.
PAID for Paving	8,143	18	– ½
— Scavenging	4,164	13	9
— Lighting	8,446	8	5 ½
— Flagging	1,917	2	5 ½
— Annuities	1,400	–	–
— Poundage to collectors	743	4	8
— Expenses relating to Corporation House	161	14	2
— Stationery, printing, and stamps	344	17	10
— Advertising and newspapers	23	9	1
— Expenses relating to nuisances	211	14	1
— Horses, forage, &c.	1,569	17	8
— Manufactory for carts, working tools and wages to artificers	2,018	–	5
— Miscellaneous expenses	113	9	2
— Salaries	4,067	14	9
— Sewers	1,008	12	–
— Law expenses	22	15	–
	34,357	11	6 ½
Balance on 5 January 1823; *viz.*			
(B.) Balance in cash	4,276	14	– ½
Cash paid on account of several demands which were not finally closed on 5 January 1823	2,296	–	8
£.	40,930	6	3

(B.)—The balance of cash of £. 4,276. 14. 0½. remained in hands to be applied towards paying the debts that remained due up to 5 January 1823, amounting to the sum of £. 6,381. 9. 2½.

Dublin,
6th May 1823.

Given under our Corporation Seal.

James Hendrick, Treasurer.
W. Little, Secretary.

POLICE AND WATCH.

AN ACCOUNT of the Income and Expenditure of the Police and Watch Establishments of the City of Dublin, from 6th January 1822 to 5th January 1823.

INCOME.	POLICE Establishment.			WATCH Establishment.			TOTAL.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Balance on 5th January 1822	–	–	–	3,632	1	8 ¼	3,632	1	8 ¼
From treasury	30,333	6	8	–	–	–	30,333	6	8
House tax	–	–	–	7,226	2	2 ½	7,226	2	2 ½
Carriage tax	–	–	–	4,738	3	8	4,738	3	8
D° - - - fees and fines	–	–	–	391	3	1 ½	391	3	1 ½
Public office - - - d°	736	8	9 ½	–	–	–	736	8	9 ½
Hotel licences	–	–	–	625	–	–	625	–	–
Pawnbrokers d°	–	–	–	5,000	–	–	5,000	–	–
Publicans - - d°	–	–	–	505	10	–	505	10	–
Old clothes d°	–	–	–	6	–	–	6	–	–
Incidents	35	1	2	97	–	–	132	1	2
£.	31,104	16	7 ½	22,221	–	8 ¼	53,325	17	3 ¾

EXPENDITURE.	POLICE Establishment.			WATCH Establishment.			TOTAL.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Rents	604	18	9	426	7	9	1,031	6	6
Taxes	190	2	7 ½	105	11	6 ½	295	14	2
Repairs	793	17	5 ½	133	1	2 ¾	926	18	8 ¼
Stationery, and Hue and Cry	435	18	6 ½	1,348	18	11	1,784	17	5 ½
Newpapers and advertising	94	12	11 ½	–	–	–	94	12	11 ½
Law expenses	171	15	3	–	–	–	171	15	3
Coals and candles	552	11	– ¾	317	12	5	870	3	5 ¾
Salaries	13,479	–	1 ¼	1,140	1	10 ½	14,619	1	11 ¾
Weekly pay	12,473	4	2	13,900	5	9 ½	26,373	9	11 ½
Horses	180	17	3	–	–	–	180	17	3
Forage	782	10	7	–	–	–	782	10	7
Clothing	1,720	7	7 ½	550	–	11	2,270	8	6 ½
Accoutrements	574	14	8 ½	–	–	–	574	14	8 ½
Incidents	1,051	16	2	233	18	2	1,285	14	4
							51,262	5	10 ¼
Balance on 5th Jan. 1823	–	–	–	–	–	–	2,063	11	5 ½
£.	33,106	7	3	18,155	18	7 ¼	53,325	17	3 ¾

Head Office of Police, Dublin,
5th May 1823.

John C. Lees, Rec^r.

PARISH OF ST. ANNE.

A RETURN of the Receipts and Disbursements, on account of Parish Cess, for the year ending 29th September 1822.

Dr

				£.	s.	d.
To the gentlemen curates, for performing early service				200	–	–
To salaries to parish officers				300	12	3
To sacramental bread and wine				27	6	7½
To rewards to engine keepers				6	4	4
To coals and candles				21	–	11
To stationery				4	14	7
To repairs of church, and incidental expenses				79	13	6
To collector for poundage on £.675. 18. 8. at 1*s.* per pound				33	15	11
Balance handed to succeeding churchwardens				13	7	11½
£.				686	16	1

Cr

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
By balance from former churchwarden				10	17	5
By amount of collecting book for 1821, applotted at the rate of 16*d.* per shilling, minister's money, the gross sum of which is £.645. 4. 0.	860	5	11			
Deduct arrears of 1821, uncollected	218	15	3			
Total collected for 1821				641	10	8
By arrears of former years collected				34	8	–
£.				686	16	1

Arthur Morrison,
Joshua Nunn, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. AUDEON.

RETURN of the Churchwardens of St. Audeon's Parish, in the City of Dublin.

	£.	s.	d.	
Amount of minister's money collected for the year 1821 - received	170	12	–	Minister's money, due the 29th September 1822: none collected yet.
Insolvencies and uncollectable	76	3	–	
Total amount £.	246	15	–	
Amount of parish cess collected for the year 1821 - received	338	11	11	Parish cess due the 29th Sept. 1822: none collected yet.
Insolvencies and uncollectable	158	12	11	
Total amount £.	497	4	10	
Grand jury cess, due Easter term 1822	393	11	9	Re-applotted for Michaelmas 1821.
Insolvencies and uncollectable	121	7	4	
Total amount £.	514	18	1	
Grand jury cess, due Michaelmas term 1822	410	4	8	Re-applotted for Easter 1822.
Insolvencies and uncollectable	151	15	1	
Total amount £.	561	19	9	

PARISH OF ST. BRIDGET.

		£.	s.	d.
	From 1821 to 1822 - - - - one year:			
Sept. 29.	To amount of parish cess applotted	778	16	11
	By cash received	380	9	7
		£.398	7	4

The sum of three hundred and ninety-eight pounds seven shillings and four-pence is considered as lost in consequence of insolvencies.

St. Bridget's Vestry-room,
15 May 1823.

Fredk Dempster,
George Cutler, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. CATHARINE.

A RETURN of Taxes collected in the Parish of St. Catharine, Dublin, so far as comes under the knowledge or control of the Churchwardens.

Minister's Money

On 1,800 houses, which this parish contains, amounts to £.510; but on account of the number of houses which are unoccupied, and the insolvency of a great many of the parishioners, the average collection is only about - - - - - £.350. 0. 0.

Parish Cess,

For repairs of the church, and other necessary charges attending the same, applotted last year at the rate of 1*s.* 5*d.* to the shilling on the minister's money received, the sum collected amounts to - - - - - - - - - - £.444. 11. 1.

Easter Dues,

For the support of the parish clerk, payable by custom at nine-pence for each house, would amount to upwards of sixty pounds per year; but as the payment is generally resisted, the average collection is only about - - - - - - - - £.16. 0. 0.

Grand Jury Cess.

Of this tax, the churchwardens have only the power of calling vestries to applot the amount of warrants issued by the Court of King's Bench at Easter and Michaelmas terms every year, the collectors being appointed by, and accountable to the grand jury.

Dan^l Watson,
W^m Ord, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. JAMES.

AMOUNT of the Cess of the Parish of St. James, applotted for the year 1822.

	£.	s.	d.
The applotment for the above year, at the rate of 2*s.* 3*d.* to the minister's shilling on the city, and 1*s.* 1*d.* to ditto on the county part of said parish, amounted to - - - - - - - - - - - -	255	13	7
Of which sum, up to the 5th of May, there has been only collected - -	151	4	–
Leaving a balance of - - - - -	£.104	9	7

Little more of which can be expected, owing to the extreme poverty of the parish.

With respect to the grand jury cess, the churchwardens are entirely under the control of the grand jury, to applot according to their warrant, at Easter and Michaelmas. The sums for last year applotted:

For Easter - - - - - - - -	£.168. 12. 11.
Michaelmas - - - - - -	174. 11. 5.
Together with uncollected arrears amounting to - - -	203. 16. 3.

The vestry clerk makes out the applotment book, according to the sum, and then becomes under the control of the grand jury city treasurer.

Also, on account of the recent alteration in levying the Foundling Hospital tax, there is no child admitted without the sum of five pounds, to be raised and paid with them by the churchwardens, which payment is resisted by the greater proportion of the parishioners, and there is no mode of enforcing the payment.

PARISH OF ST. LUKE.

A RETURN of Taxes collected in the Parish of St. Luke, Dublin, so far as comes under the control of the Churchwardens.

Minister's Money

On 381 houses, which this parish contains, amounts to £.114. 6*s.* 10*d.*; but on account of a number of houses unoccupied, and the insolvency of a great many of the parishioners, the average collection is only - - - - - - - - - - £.96. 0. 0.

Parish Cess.

For repairs of the church and other necessary charges attending the same, applotted last year, at the rate of 1*s.* 6*d.* to the shilling on the minister's money, amounts to £.144; but for the above-mentioned reasons, there has only been collected last year, £.123. 14. 0.

Clerk's Dues,

For the support of the parish clerk, being nine-pence per house, would amount to £.14. 5*s.* 7*d.*; but which the inhabitants in general resist, so that the average collection is only about - - - - - - - - - - - - - £.4. 0. 0.

James Arthur,
John Ridley, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. MARK.

THE Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Mark return the following, for the information of Parliament, as the amount and particulars of Church Rates assessed in Vestry, and to be levied for and in the above-named Parish, for the Year 1822, for the necessary maintenance of the church establishment therein.

AT a Vestry legally called and held in the Vestry-room of said Parish, on the 16th day of April 1822, to assess the Parish Rates, the following were agreed to; *viz.*

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
The curate, for early service for one year	100	–	–
The vestry clerk, for one year's salary	32	10	–
- D° - for stationery for vestry	1	14	1½
Parish clerk, for one year's salary, in lieu of the ninepences	20	–	–
- D° - for one year attending early service	5	13	9
The organist, for one year's salary	30	–	–
- D° - for instructing the children in psalmody	10	–	–
The sexton, for one year's salary	40	–	–
Gallery sextonness, for one year's salary	13	13	–
Vestry-maid, for washing surplices, &c.	4	11	–
The beadle, for one year's salary and clothing	28	8	9
The grave-digger, for poor graves	10	–	–
The bell-ringer, for one year's salary	10	–	–
Bread and wine for the sacrament	10	–	–
Coals for the church	15	–	–
Samuel Loughlin, (sexton) additional for one year	10	–	–
Engine-keeper, for one year's salary	11	7	6
Coffins for the poor, for one year	40	–	–
Apothecary, for medicines for the poor, one year	34	2	6
Collector's salary	40	–	–
£.	467	–	7½

The above is to be considered as the usual and annual church rates, assessed in vestry, and levied on the parish, for the maintenance of the church establishment therein, and liable to little or no variation.

The following Items, included in the account of last year, are not to be considered as part of the usual yearly Rates, but are merely balances of accounts due from preceding years, as each item sets forth:—

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
TO Balance of account due the Morning Post, for advertisements on parochial business	5	4	–
Mr. Underwood, for printing, &c. &c. &c.	3	2	–
Freeman's Journal - - d°	16	19	7
Mr. Clarke, for ironmongery for the church	35	–	9½
Mr. Thomas Hand, for coals for - - d°	3	17	5
Mr. Robert Lovely, slater's work for - d°	26	4	9
Mr. Cockburn, stonecutter's work for - d°	3	14	–
Mr. Shaw, wine for sacramental uses	19	18	8½
Mr. Peile, for coals for the church	6	3	–
Balance of account due to the coffinmaker, for poor coffins	30	–	–
	150	4	3
One year's assessment from above	467	–	7½
£.	617	4	10½

Dublin, April 16th, 1822.

Rich. G. Ogle,
Thomas Peile, } Churchwardens.

ST. MARY'S PARISH.

Return of parish cess, collected in the above parish, from Easter 1822 to Easter 1823 - - - - -	- £.865. 17. 9

Dublin,
May 10th, 1823.

James Leedorn,
George Holmes, } Churchwardens.

ST. MICHAEL'S PARISH.

ACCOUNT of the Parish Cess of St. Michael's Parish, Dublin, for the Year ending 25th March 1823.

Amount of sum applotted and assessed for said year, at the rate of 2 *s.* 1¾ *d.* to the minister's shilling - - - -	£.105. 10. 11.

From the very great poverty of the parish, and the dilapidated state of most of the houses causing great arrears, what has been collected of the above sum did not prove sufficient, and there still remains due to sundry parish creditors, for parish uses, a sum of - - - - - - - - - - - - - £.35. 2. 1.

(signed, by order) *Val. Duggan*, Vestry Clerk.

PARISH OF ST. NICHOLAS, WITHOUT.

A RETURN of Taxes collected in the Parish of St. Nicholas without the Walls, Dublin, so far as comes under the control of the Churchwardens.

Parish cess applotted once in each year for repairs of church, paying parish officers, paying expenses incurred by fire engines, &c. &c. the rate of applotment for the year ending 1st August 1821, was one shilling and three-pence to the minister's shilling, and amounted to the sum of - - - - - - - - - - - - £.237. 5. 3.

But owing to the great number of shut-up and of insolvent houses, the sum collected amounted only to - - - - - - - - - - - £.152, 15. 8.

13th May 1823.

Richard Atkinson,
Joseph Brown, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. NICHOLAS, WITHIN.

AMOUNT of Parish Cess for one Year, from the 25th March 1822 to the 25th March 1823.

The sum applotted for said year, one hundred and nineteen pounds, fourteen shillings, and three-pence; at the rate of two shillings and three-pence to the shilling minister's money.

This statement is furnished by order of the House of Commons, dated 14th April 1823.

From the extreme poverty of the parish, there are many housekeepers not able to pay parish cess or minister's money.

John Lee,
Thomas Bradshaw, } Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. PETER.

The Return of the Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Peter, Dublin.

An ACCOUNT showing the amount of Parish Cess, applotted in the Parish of St. Peter, situated partly in the city and partly in the county of Dublin, in the year 1822, together with the amount received of same, and the Sum outstanding when the Account closed at Easter 1823.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Parish of St. Peter, in the city of Dublin:						
Parish cess, applotted in the year 1822, at the rate of ten-pence in the shilling of the valuation on the houses for minister's money - - - - - -				808	17	5½
Collected of the above, to Easter 1823, when account closed for the year - - - - - - - - - -	725	6	8½			
Arrears outstanding, about two-thirds of which is due on insolvent and unoccupied houses - - - - - - - -	83	10	9			
	£.808	17	5½			

N. B.—The above part of the parish pays city of Dublin grand jury cess.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Part of the Parish of St. Peter, in the county of Dublin:						
Parish cess, applotted in the year 1822, at the rate above-mentioned on houses, and at ten-pence per acre on lands - - - - - - - - -				253	8	3½
Collected of same, to Easter 1823 - - - - - - -	190	12	1			
Arrears outstanding, the same observation as to insolvent and unoccupied houses, is applicable to this part of the parish - -	62	16	2½			
	£. 253	8	3½			
Total applotted - - - - £.				1,062	5	9

N. B.—This part of the parish pays county of Dublin grand jury cess.

Given under our hands at Dublin, the 14th day of May 1823,

Benjⁿ Bull, jun. }
Rich^d W. Greene, } Churchwardens.

ST. PAUL'S PARISH.

THE Churchwardens have no control over any tax, except the parish cess, which, for the year 1822, amounted, as per vestry book, to - - - £.303. 18. 10. - - - The sum collected of same, to this day, is - - - £.167. 7. 11½. - - - with little chance of more, the parish is so wretchedly poor.

The churchwardens are obliged, under the control of the grand jury, to applot according to their warrant, each Easter and Michaelmas, the sums fiated therein, *viz.*

	£.	s.	d.
For Easter 1822 - - - - - - -	509	15	10
Michaelmas - - - - - - -	531	12	9
	£.1,041	8	7

With a claim of - - - £.831. - - - of uncollected arrears, due by the parish. The moment the vestry clerk makes out the applotment book, it becomes under the sole control of the grand jury and the city treasurer for public money.

We have omitted noticing a new law enforcing £.5. for the Foundling Hospital with every deserted child found in each parish, which, though having paid £.10. with two, we are unable to collect from the parish, who resist it; the Act being so worded, that even the magistrates cannot direct us how to proceed.

3d May 1823.

Cha^s Gibbons, 8, Ellis's Quay, }
John Tate, 3, Grange Gorman-lane, } Churchwardens.

ST. JOHN'S PARISH, DUBLIN.

WE beg leave to state, that we are unacquainted with the accounts of any department of local taxes, their amount or disbursements, raised in Dublin, except those of the parish cess of this parish, and of the grand jury cess of the same; and this cess only as far as relates to the applotment on the parishioners at Easter and at Michaelmas in each year; of each of which we subjoin the following abstract; *viz.*

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Total amount of parish cess commencing Easter 1821 and ending Easter 1822 -				264	9	2
Deduct from said amount insolvencies uncollectable - - -	100	–	6			
Paid by us in legal expenses - - - - - -	191	6	–			
	£. 291	6	6			
Leaving a balance due to us, to Easter 1822, of - - - -				26	17	4
£.				291	6	6
Gross amount of grand jury cess, applotted in this parish, Easter 1822 - -				334	1	8
- D° - of - - d° - applotted in - - d° - Michaelmas 1822 -				343	6	6
Total amount of grand jury cess, including arrears due thereon for the year 1822 - - - - - - - - - -				677	8	2
Add parish cess, as above - - - - - - - -				264	9	2
TOTAL amount of grand jury and parish cesses applotted on the parishioners of this parish, for the year 1822 - - - - - - - - - -				941	17	4

	£.	s.	d.
The minister's money averages annually about - -	93	–	–
The parish clerk's Easter dues about - - - -	5	10	–
	£. 98	10	–

9th May 1823.

Robt Fletcher,
Thomas Mason, Churchwardens.

PARISH OF ST. WERBURGH.

Parish Rate Cess, for one Year, ending 29th September 1822 - - £. 225. 0. 0.

(By order) *Wm. Henry Finlay,* Vestry Clerk.

ST. THOMAS'S PARISH.

WE beg leave to state, that the total sum applotted as parish cess, in our department for the past year, was - - - £.678. 7. 1. - - - of which sum only - - £. 435 s. 5 d. 10 could be collected;

Together with - - - - 64 19 10 arrears of former years.

In all - - - - - - £.500 5 8 accounted for at Easter last, by our predecessors in office.

15 May 1823.

Christopher Antisell,
John Elliott, Churchwardens.

SAINT GEORGE'S PARISH.

THE Order of the House of Commons seems to apply to the city of Dublin; the parish of Saint George's is situated in the county. It would therefore appear, as not coming within the meaning of the order referred to.

10th May 1823.

George Chamley,
Thomas Webb, Churchwardens.

SAINT ANDREW'S PARISH.

AMOUNT of Parish Cess, for the Year commencing 25th March 1822, and ending 25th March 1823 - - - - - - - £. 1,023. 4. 0½

Edward Trim,
James Moore,
H. Willis, Churchwardens.

Appendix, N° 2.

An ACCOUNT of the Fee called Chapter and Guild, levied on all Vessels clearing from the Port of Dublin, for 20 years, ending the 24th day of December 1822, with the Appropriation thereof.

YEARS ending 24th December	SUM RECEIVED.			How same has been appropriated.											
				RECORDER.			SHERIFFS.			Water-Bailiffs.			RECEIVER.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1803	111	16	2	27	19	–½	27	19	–½	27	19	–½	27	9	–½
1804	109	16	–	27	9	–	27	9	–	27	9	–	27	9	–
1805	89	9	6	22	7	4½	22	7	4½	22	7	4½	22	7	4½
1806	72	18	6	18	4	7½	18	4	7½	18	4	7½	18	4	7½
1807	71	3	6	17	15	10½	17	15	10½	17	15	10½	17	15	10½
1808	62	3	6	15	10	10½	15	10	10½	15	10	10½	15	10	10½
1809	66	1	6	16	10	4½	16	10	4½	16	10	4½	16	10	4½
1810	80	5	–	20	1	3	20	1	3	20	1	3	20	1	3
1811	74	6	6	18	11	7½	18	11	7½	18	11	7½	18	11	7½
1812	78	16	–	19	14	–	19	14	–	19	14	–	19	14	–
1813	73	9	9	18	7	5¼	18	7	5¼	18	7	5¼	18	7	5¼
1814	75	7	–	18	16	9	18	16	9	18	16	9	18	16	9
1815	77	16	6	19	9	1½	19	9	1½	19	9	1½	19	9	1½
1816	70	10	5	17	12	7¼	17	12	7¼	17	12	7¼	17	12	7¼
1817	79	18	6	19	19	7½	19	19	7½	19	19	7½	19	19	7½
1818	86	8	–	21	12	–	21	12	–	21	12	–	21	12	–
1819	104	1	6	26	–	4½	26	–	4½	26	–	4½	26	–	4½
1820	94	1	6	23	10	4½	23	10	4½	23	10	4½	23	10	4½
1821	85	10	–	21	7	6	21	7	6	21	7	6	21	7	6
1822	107	3	6	26	15	10½	26	15	10½	26	15	10½	26	15	10½

6 May 1823.

Edw. Hamerton.

Appendix, N° 3.

An ACCOUNT of the amount of Taxes on Job Carriages, on Cars, Carts, Sedan Chairs, Stallkeepers, Pawnbrokers, and Spirit Retailers, contributed to the Watch and Police Establishment of Dublin, during each of the last seven Years.

YEARS	Job Carriages, Cars, Carts, and Sedan Chairs.			Stallkeepers.			Pawnbrokers.			Spirit Retailers.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1816 - -	5,467	5	4½	94	–	–	4,500	–	–	546	–	–
1817 - -	4,696	13	3	88	–	–	4,400	–	–	418	–	–
1818 - -	4,303	1	6½	96	–	–	5,400	–	–	361	–	–
1819 - -	3,825	18	8	108	–	–	5,700	–	–	462	–	–
1820 - -	4,357	12	10½	94	–	–	5,300	–	–	456	–	–
1821 - -	4,612	16	11	42	–	–	5,400	–	–	493	10	–
1822 - -	4,738	3	8	6	–	–	5,000	–	–	505	10	–
£.	32,001	12	3½	528	–	–	35,700	–	–	3,242	–	–

Receiver's Office,
Head Office of Police, Dublin,
29th March 1823.

John C. Lees.

Appendix, N° 4.

RETURN of the Salaries and Emoluments of the Keepers of the several Prisons in Dublin, specifying the sources from whence their Emoluments arise; for the last Eight Years, distinguishing each Year.

YEAR	SMITHFIELD.		RICHMOND BRIDEWELL.		NEWGATE.			CITY MARSHALSEA.			SHERIFFS PRISON.
	SALARY.	Emolument on Weaving.	SALARY.	FEES, &c.	SALARY.	Presented, in lieu of Fees.	Average of Rents. No Account kept.	SALARY.	RENTS.	FEES.	
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
1815 - -	120 – –	- - -	- - Not opened - -		400 – –	121 5 –	200 – –	No record is kept for these four years. The keeper is dead.			No Salary is allowed; certain Rents and Fees are established, and the Keeper, after paying all the expenses of the prison, receives the balance, of which there is no record until the appointment of Mr. Woods, consequently no account can be given but for the last six months, £. 103. 12. 5. net profit.
1816 - -	140 – –	- - -	- - - D°	- - -	400 – –	146 13 4	200 – –				
1817 - -	140 – –	- - -	- - - D°	- - -	400 – –	171 6 8	200 – –				
1818 - -	140 – –	- - -	300 – –	50 – – 70 use of land.	400 – –	216 16 8	200 – –				
1819 - -	140 – –	40 – –	300 – –	- - -	400 – –	200 16 8	200 – –	32 – –	78 9 6	82 10 –	
1820 - -	70 – –	39 10 –	300 – –	- - -	400 – –	191 13 4	200 – –	- - -	80 11 9	89 4 9	
1821 - -	78 15 –	19 15 –	300 – –	- - -	400 – –	193 16 8	200 – –	- - -	93 13 9	90 17 3	
1822 - -	120 – –	39 12 6	400 – –	- - -	400 – –	250 13 4	200 – –	- - -	89 14 –	97 12 11	

	PRISON.	1815.	1816.	1817.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
TOTALS.	(A.)—SMITHFIELD - - - - -	120 – –	140 – –	140 – –	140 – –	180 – –	109 10 –	98 10 –	159 12 6
	RICHMOND BRIDEWELL - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	420 – –	300 – –	300 – –	300 – –	400 – –
	(B.)—NEWGATE - - - - -	721 5 –	746 13 4	771 6 8	816 16 8	800 16 8	791 13 4	793 16 8	850 13 4
	CITY MARSHALSEA - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	192 19 6	169 16 6	184 11 –	187 6 11
	SHERIFFS PRISON - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	103 12 5 for half the year.

(A.)—In 1820, the females were removed to Richmond Bridewell. In 1822, the female side was filled again.

(B.)—Rents are now discontinued at Newgate, by order of the Court of King's Bench.

R. R. Woodward,
Insp^r General of Prisons.

Appendix, N° 5.

ACCOUNTS from the Commissioners for Paving the Streets of Dublin; of Money due from the Corporation; of Salaries paid during the last seven years; of retired Allowances; of Miles of Streets and Roads under the management of the Paving Board; of Prices paid for Materials; and of Prices paid for Day Labourers.

N° 1.—A RETURN of the amount remaining due from the Corporation of the City of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. the Streets of Dublin, pursuant to the 49th, 50th, and 51st sections of the 47 Geo. 3. c. 109.

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
PAVING:			
On the 25th March 1823, there remained due from the corporation of the city of Dublin, pursuant to the 49th section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being two years composition for paving certain places, the total sum of - - - - - - -	600	–	–
And on the 25th March 1823, there remained due from the corporation of the city of Dublin, pursuant to the 49th section of the 47th Geo. 3. c. 109. for the pavement round St. Stephen's Green, being the amount of half a year to this day, the sum of - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	25	–	–
This latter payment has been made through the Commissioners for the improvement of St. Stephen's Green.			
LIGHTING:			
On the 25th March 1823, there remained due from the corporation of the city of Dublin, pursuant to the 50th section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being two years composition for lighting globes at certain places, the total sum of - - - -	40	–	–
CLEANSING:			
On the 25th March 1823, there remained due from the corporation of the city of Dublin, pursuant to the 51st section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being five years composition for cleansing the streets thereof, making a total sum of - - -	10,000	–	–
And for the recovery of this sum, proceedings are now at issue before the court of Chancery.			

James Hendrick,
Treasurer.

Given under our Corporation Seal,

Dublin,
19th May 1823.

W. Little,
Sec^{y}.

N° 2.—A RETURN of the Amount of Salaries paid by the Commissioners for Paving, &
Reduction of Salaries, durin

NAME.	OFFICE.	YEAR ending 5 January 1817.			YEAR ending 5 January 1818.			YEAR ending 5 January 1819.			YEAR ending 5 January 1820.		
		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Major Alexander Taylor	First Commissioner	600	–	–	600	–	–	600	–	–	600	–	–
Alderman M. Bloxham	Commissioners	500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–
Colonel Thomas Nesbitt		500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–
Sir Charles Coote, bart.		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thomas N. Edgeworth, esq.		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sir Charles Coote, bart.	Supervisors of Works	400	–	–	400	–	–	400	–	–	400	–	–
Capt. George Taylor		400	–	–	200	–	–	-	-	-	-	-	-
George Taylor, jun. esq.		-	-	-	200	–	–	400	–	–	400	–	–
William Little, esq.	Secretary	300	–	–	300	–	–	300	–	–	300	–	–
James Hendrick	Treasurer	500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–	500	–	–
Simon Brigley	Clerks in the Secretary's office	150	–	–	150	–	–	150	–	–	150	–	–
Richard Landey		105	–	–	120	–	–	120	–	–	120	–	–
Edward Mitchell		85	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
John Hendrick	Clerks in the Treasurer's office	50	–	–	50	–	–	50	–	–	50	–	–
Garat Barry		25	–	–	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plunket Preston		97	10	–	130	–	–	130	–	–	130	–	–
Henry Parr		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
John Minty	Sub-supervisors of Works	120	–	–	120	–	–	120	–	–	120	–	–
James Pride		40	3	10	-	-	-	72	4	10	-	-	-
Peter Finnerty		79	14	6	120	–	–	30	–	–	-	-	-
Charles Wilson		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	5	6½
John Reily	Clerks in the Supervisor's of Works office	130	–	–	130	–	–	130	–	–	130	–	–
James Dowling		59	3	–	59	3	–	59	3	–	30	14	3
William Coote		-	-	-	-	-	-	45	–	–	60	–	–
Henry Parr		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	–	4½
Hector M'Millan		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
William Nevin	Superintendnt of Horses	100	–	–	83	2	5	91	17	1	100	–	–
S. Clindenin	Housekeeper	39	11	6	39	11	6	40	11	6	55	10	–
Edward Lynch	Messengers	26	17	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
William Costello		49	6	8	52	–	–	52	–	–	52	–	–
C. Dempsey		52	–	–	52	–	–	52	–	–	52	–	–
Hector M'Millan		25	19	3	52	–	–	52	–	–	52	–	–
John Talbot		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plunket Preston	Storekeepers	32	10	–	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alexander Johnston		-	-	-	130	–	–	23	10	1	-	-	-
Peter Finnerty		-	-	-	-	-	-	90	–	–	120	–	–
Joseph O'Connor		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
George Halloran	Inspectors of Scavenging	100	2	–	15	8	–	-	-	-	-	-	-
David Somers		98	1	9	100	2	–	90	3	1	-	-	-
John M'Kenzie		-	-	-	72	14	6	3	17	–	-	-	-
John Bell		-	-	-	-	-	-	55	5	–	78	–	–
Edward Hendrick		-	-	-	-	-	-	10	11	9	100	2	–
F. Cameron	Measurer of Pipe openings	115	1	–	115	1	–	115	1	–	115	1	–
William Tassie	Overseer of Works	180	–	–	180	–	–	180	–	–	180	–	–
	TOTAL £.	4,961	–	7	5,071	2	5	5,063	4	4	5,039	13	2

James Hendrick,
Treasurer.

the Streets of Dublin, for Seven Years, ending 5th January 1823; distinguishing the
each of said Years.

YEAR ending 5 January 1821.			YEAR ending 5 January 1822.			YEAR ending 5 January 1823.			
£.	*s.*	*d.*	£.	*s.*	*d.*	£.	*s.*	*d.*	
600	-	-	600	-	-	600	-	-	
500	-	-	500	-	-	500	-	-	
457	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	Died 9th December 1820.
-	-	-	503	11	6	417	16	2	Appointed commissioner 23d Dec. 1821, and commission withdrawn 6th Nov. 1822.
-	-	-	-	-	-	54	15	10	Appointed commissioner 28th November 1822.
400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed commissioner 23d December 1821; the vacancy of supervisor of works not filled up.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Resigned 5th July 1817.
400	-	-	400	-	-	400	-	-	Appointed 5th July 1817.
300	-	-	300	-	-	300	-	-	
500	-	-	500	-	-	500	-	-	
150	-	-	140	-	-	130	-	-	A reduction of 20*l.* per annum took place from 5th July 1821.
135	-	-	105	-	-	90	-	-	Salary increased 20*l.* per annum, from 10th October 1816, and a gratuity of 15*l.* granted to this officer for the year 1820; a reduction of 30*l.* per annum took place from 5th July 1821.
100	-	-	90	-	-	80	-	-	Salary increased 20*l.* per ann. from 10th October 1816, and a reduction of 20*l.* per ann. took place from 5th July 1821.
40	10	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	Died 30th October 1820; the vacancy not filled up.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Resigned 5th April 1816.
135	13	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred from the office of storekeeper, 5th April 1816; resigned on account of ill health, 5 Sept. 1820; and received in that year a gratuity of 50*l.*
-	-	-	44	10	-	50	-	-	Transferred from the office of clerk in the supervisors of works office, 5th January 1821; 5th July 1821, salary increased 11*l.* per ann.
120	-	-	120	-	-	120	-	-	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Resigned 6th May 1816; re-appointed 5th January 1818, at 80*l.* per annum; 5th July 1818, increased to 120*l.*; reduced to 100*l.* 10th October; and resigned 20th October 1818.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 7th May 1816, at 120*l.* per ann. transferred to storekeeper 5th April 1818.
7	7	10½	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 3d Aug. 1819, at 22*s.* 9*d.* per week; resigned 19th Feb. 1820; vacancy not filled up.
130	-	-	130	-	-	130	-	-	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Resigned 11th July 1819.
60	-	-	60	-	-	37	17	9	Appointed 5th April 1818, at 60*l.* per ann.; resigned 22d August 1822.
39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 12th July 1819, at 39*l.* per annum; transferred to Treasurer's office, 5th January 1821; vacancy not filled up.
-	-	-	-	-	-	8	10	11	Promoted from the situation of messenger, 15th November 1822, to the salary of 60*l.* per annum.
100	-	-	92	10	-	85	-	-	Salary reduced to 70*l.* p'ann. 13 June 1817; 12 Apr. 1818, salary increased to 100*l.* p' ann.; and on 5 July 1821, a reduction of 15*l.* p' ann. took place.
50	10	-	45	10	-	45	10	-	An increase of 1*l.* to gratuity in 1818, and an increase to salary of 15*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.* from 5th January 1819; a decrease of 5*l.* in gratuity in 1820, and the gratuity of 10*l.* discontinued in 1821 and 1822.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Resigned 11th July 1816.
52	-	-	46	-	-	40	-	-	Salary 40*l.* per ann. to 26th March 1816, then increased to 52*l.* per ann. and a reduction of 12*l.* per ann. took place from 5th July 1821.
52	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	Died 5th April 1821; the vacancy not filled up.
52	-	-	46	-	-	33	16	8	Appointed 20 July 1816, at 52*l.* p'ann.; reduced 5 July 1821, 10*l.* p'ann.; and promoted to clerk in Supervisors of Works office, 15 Nov. 1822.
-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	5	Appointed 16th November 1822, at a salary of 30*l.* per annum.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred to Treasurers office, 5th April 1816
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 5th January 1817, and resigned 12th March 1818.
120	-	-	100	-	-	80	-	-	Transferred from sub-supervisor of works, 5th April 1818; salary reduced 40*l.* per annum, 5th July 1821; discontinued 5th January 1823.
-	-	-	-	-	-	80	-	-	Appointed 18th December 1821, at a salary of 80*l.* per annum.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred to the situation of a weekly overseer of labourers, 22d Feb. 1817.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred to the situation of a collector of taxes, 20th November 1818.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 22d February 1817, at 78*l.* per ann.; increased to 100*l.* 2*s.* per ann. 27th August 1817, and transferred to the situation of a weekly overseer of labourers, 10th January 1818.
79	10	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	Appointed 12 April 1818, at 78*l.* p' ann.; office discontinued 19 May 1821.
132	-	6	120	2	-	100	2	-	Appointed 20th Nov. 1818, at 100*l.* 2*s.* per ann. (*vice* Somers); received gratuities, in 1820, of 30*l.* and in 1821 of 20*l.* discontinued in 1822.
117	5	3	2	4	3	-	-	-	Died 6th January 1821; the vacancy not filled up.
180	-	-	180	-	-	180	-	-	
5,010	1	4½	4,168	7	9	4,067	14	9	

Given under our Corporation Seal,
Dublin, 19th May 1823.

W. Little, Secʳ.

N° 3.—A RETURN of the amount of Annuities paid to the former Commissioners, &c. for Paving the Streets of Dublin, for Fourteen Years, ending 22d August 1822.

ANNUITIES Payable pursuant to the 3d Section 47 Geo. 3. c. 109.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1810.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1811.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1812.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1813.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1814.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1815.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1816.
Commissioners :	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.
Hugh Henry Mitchell, Esq. - -	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –
Rob. Alexander, the younger, Esq.	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Richard Cane, Esq. - - - -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
William John Alexander, Esq. -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Joseph Mason Ormsby, Esq. -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Stephen Ormsby, Esq. - - -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	100 –	300 –
Secretary :							
Sir William J. Homan, Bart -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	100 –
Treasurer :							
Colⁿ Henry Gore Sankey - -	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –
Inspector of Accounts :							
Samuel Greene - - - - - -	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –
TOTAL - - £.	1,750 –	1,750 –	1,750 –	1,750 –	1,750 –	1,650 –	1,750 –

(Repeated.)	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1817.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1818.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1819.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1820.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1821.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1822.	YEAR Ending 5 Jan. 1823.
Commissioners :	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.
Hugh Henry Mitchell, Esq. - -	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –	300 –
Rob. Alexander, the younger, Esq.	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Richard Cane, Esq. - - - -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
William John Alexander, Esq. -	200 –	200 –	200 –	240 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Joseph Mason Ormsby, Esq. -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	(*a*) 200 –	—	—
Stephen Ormsby, Esq. - - -	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Secretary :							
Sir William J. Homan, Bart. -	300 –	100 –	300 –	200 –	200 –	200 –	200 –
Treasurer :							
Colⁿ Henry Gore Sankey - -	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –	150 –	(*b*) 150 –	—
Inspector of Accounts :							
Samuel Greene - - - - - -	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –	100 –
TOTAL - - £.	1,850 –	1,650 –	1,850 –	1,750 –	1,750 –	1,550 –	1,400 –

And on the 5th January 1823, there was one quarter's annuity paid on account to Hugh Henry Mitchell, Esq. from 22d August to 22d November 1822 - - } £. 75. 0. 0.

(*a*) The last payment made to the late J. M. Ormsby, Esq.
(*b*) The last payment made to the late Colⁿ Henry Gore Sankey.

James Hendrick, Treasurer.

Dublin, 19th May 1823. } Given under our Corporation Seal, *W. Little*, Sec^y.

N° 4.—AN ACCOUNT of the number of Miles of Streets and Roads under the management of the Commissioners for Paving, Cleansing, and Lighting the Streets of Dublin.

Fifty-two Irish Miles, or Sixty-six English Miles.

R. Landey, Measuring Clerk.

Dublin, 19th May 1823. } Given under our Corporation Seal, *W. Little*, Sec^y.

N° 5.—AN ACCOUNT of the Prices paid for Materials of different descriptions, per cubic yard or other measure; and also for all kinds of Work done by the square yard or other measure, in each of the last five years.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Yorkshire Flags, *viz.*					
Large, $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches thick	6/2 British, p' y^{d}	same as last year	same as 1818	5/8 British, p' y^{d}	same as those stated for last year.
3 "	7/1 "			6/6 "	
$3\frac{1}{2}$ "	8/ "			7/3 "	
4 "	9/ "			8/ "	
Small, $2\frac{1}{2}$ "	5/10 "			5/4 "	
3 "	6/10 "			6/4 "	
Curb	- nil -	1/8 British, per foot lineal	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.

The reduction of price in 1821, occurred on the 23d of October in that year. The purchases previously made were at the old prices.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Irish Flags, *viz.*					
Curb of Mountain stone	11*d.* p' foot super^{l}	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	9*d.* p' foot lineal.

The curb purchased in 1822, was 8 inches broad; that purchased in the previous years was 11 inches.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Carlow Flags - dressed	$4/\frac{1}{2}$ p' y^{d} superf^{l}	same as last year	5/ per yard	same as last year	same as 1820.
D° - curb	4/5 "	5/4	- nil -		
D° - sewers	4/ "	same as last year	same as 1818		

The increase of price was owing to superior dressing.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Quarry Flags, *viz.*					
Curses stream	3/ p' y^{d} superf^{l}	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Rathgar	- nil -	4/ p' load of $4\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.	- nil -	same as 1819	3/ p' load of $4\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.
E. Byrne's quarry	4/4 p' load of $4\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
J. Clarke's quarry	4/ p' load "	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Bricks	40/ p' thousand	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Roach Lime	11*d.* & 1/3 p' hhd.	1/3 p' hhd.	same as last year	1/2 p' hhd.	same as last year.
Building Stones - common	1/2 & 1/4 p' load of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	1/2 p' load.
D° - astlers	2/ & 1/10 p' load	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Squared quarry Paving Stones	7/ p' ton	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	- nil.
Round and sorted - d°	6/ & 5/5 p' ton	5/5 & 5/ p' ton	5/ p' ton	same as last year	4/6 p' ton.
Sand	3/ p' ton	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Shingles	2/6 p' ton	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Quarry Stones for paving stones	1/6 p' load of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.	- nil -	1/6 p' load of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cwt.	same as last year	same as last year.
Oil - per tun	£.63. 10. British	£.44. 10. British	£.37. 5. British	£.29. 0. British	£.30. 10. British.
	61. 10. "	42. 0. "	37. 0 "	27. 10. "	26. 0. "
	48. 0. "	41. 0. "	36. 0. "	25. 10. "	25. 0. "
	44. 0. "	39. 0. "	34. 0. "	29. 8. Irish	24. 10. "
	60. 0. Irish	38. 0. "	32. 10. "	28. 7. "	26. 5. Irish.
	-	36. 0. "	30. 5. "	35. 14. "	—
	-	50. 0. Irish	-	28. 0. "	—
	-	47. 0. "	—	—	—
Wick - wove	5/6 p' gross of 144 y^{ds}	same as last year	5/6 & 5/ p' gross	5/ p' gross	4/ & 3/6 p' gross.
D° - common	3/ p' lb.	2/6 p' lb.	2/ p' lb.	2/ p' lb.	1/8 p' lb.
	2/10 "	2/4 "	-	1/10 "	1/10 "
	2/8 "	2/2 "	-	1/8 "	—
	2/4 "	—	—	—	—
Lighter Yarn	4*d.* p' lb.	5*d.* p' lb.	4*d.* p' lb.	4*d.* p' lb.	4*d.* p' lb.
	-	4*d.* "	$3\frac{1}{2}$*d.* "	$3\frac{1}{2}$*d.* "	3*d.* "
	-	$3\frac{1}{2}$*d.* "	-	3*d.* "	—
	-	3*d.* "	—	—	—
Lamp glasses	10*d.* p' lb.	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Tin Ware, *viz.*					
Lamp Heads	1/4 each	same as last year	1/4 each	same as last year	same as 1818.
Rims	7*d.* "		7*d.* "		
Burners	6*d.* "		6*d.* "		
Lighters	1/10 "		1/10 "		
Large pots	- nil -		- nil -		
Small d°	- nil -		2/6 each		
Canteens	- nil -		2/ "		
Fixing rims	$\frac{3}{4}$*d.* each		$\frac{3}{4}$*d.* "		
Cross wires	1/8 p' lb.		1/4 p' lb.		
Dressing of Yorkshire flags	1*d.* p' foot round edge	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
D° of mountain-stone flags	$3\frac{1}{2}$*d.* p' foot super^{l}	- nil -	$3\frac{1}{2}$*d.* p' foot	- nil -	3*d.* p' foot.
D° of mountain stone curb	- nil -	$5\frac{1}{2}$*d.* p' f^{t} superf^{l}	same as last year	same as 1819	same as 1819.
D° of granite blocks	- nil -	4/ p' yard	same as last year	same as 1819	same as 1819.
D° of granite stones	2/ p' ton	2/6 p' ton	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
D° of - d° (finely dressed)	- nil -	- nil -	7/6 p' yard	7/6 p' yard	- nil.

(continued.)

N° 5.—Account of Prices paid for Materials, &c.—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Dressing of Carlow flags - -	- nil -	- nil -	7 *d.* p' yard -	- nil -	- nil.
D° of pebble stones raised at Gravel pit, Island Bridge	1/6 p' ton -	1/6 p' ton, to 4th Sept. afterw^{ds} 1/8	1/8 p' ton -	same as last year	same as 1820.
D° at other yards - -	1/6 p' ton - -	same as last year	1/6 p' ton to 17th June, afterw^{ds} 1/2	1/2 p' ton -	same as last year.
Sorting stones - - - -	3*d.* & 2½*d.* p' ton	3 *d.* & 2 *d.* p' ton	3 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year	same as last year.
Breaking stones raised at Gravel pit, Island Bridge	8 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
D° at other yards - -	8 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year	8*d.* p' ton to 17th June, afterw^{ds} 6*d.*	6 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year.
Raising materials at Gravel pit, Island Bridge	4 *d.* p' ton -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Sand and shingles at - d° -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	3 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year.
Excavating baring at - d° -	3 *d.* p' cubic y^{d}	- nil -	- nil -	2*d.* & 5*d.* p' cub. y^{d}	- nil.
Carting from pipe openings -	- nil -	6 *d.* p' ton -	same as last year to 26th Feb^{y}	- nil -	- nil.
D° from Gravel pit, Island Bridge to pipe openings	- nil -	1/3 p' ton -	same as last year to 26th Feb^{y}	- nil -	- nil.
Raising materials at North Strand	- nil -	4½ p' ton - -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Lighting the public lamps - -	3/ & 3/3 p' score	same as last year	same as last year	same as last year	same as last year.
Cleaning - d° - - -	5 *d.* p' score -	same as last year	same as last year	same as last year	same as last year.
Prices of Horses - - -	1 a' £.42. 1. 9.	1 a' £.28. 0.	- nil -	1 a' £.29. 0. 0.	1 a' £.22. 3. 7½.
	4 coll^{y}, 99. 19. 1.	1 a' 16. 0.	- nil -	1 a' 28. 8. 9.	—
	1 a' 42. 13. 1½.	1 a' 13. 0.	- nil -	2 coll^{y} 65. 19. 6.	—
	- - -	- - -	- nil -	8 d° 216. 2. 6.	—
	- - -	- - -	- nil -	1 a' 22. 15. 0.	—
Forage, *viz.* Hay - - - -	6/ p' cwt. -	5/ p' cwt. -	4/10 p' cwt. -	4/8 p' cwt. -	5/6 p' cwt.
	5/10 ,, - -	4/10 ,, - -	4/6 ,, - -	4/6 ,, - -	5/ ,,
	5/6 ,, - -	4/6 ,, - -	4/4 ,, - -	4/4 ,, - -	4/10 ,,
	5/5 ,, - -	4/4 ,, - -	4/ ,, - -	4/ ,, - -	4/6 ,,
	5/4 ,, - -	4/2 ,, - -	3/6 ,, - -	3/10 ,, - -	4/4 ,,
	5/3 ,, - -	4/ ,, - -	2/6 ,, - -	3/9 ,, - -	4/ ,,
	5/ ,, - -	3/6 ,, - -	2/4½ ,, - -	3/6 ,, - -	2/10 ,,
	4/11 ,, - -	2/4½ ,, - -	2/2½ ,, - -	3/3 ,, - -	—
	4/10 ,, - -	- - -	2/1 ,, - -	3/ ,, - -	—
	4/9 ,, - -	- - -	2/ ,, - -	2/8 ,, - -	—
	4/6½ ,, - -	- - -	- - -	2/ ,, - -	—
	4/6 ,, - -	—	—	—	—
	3/10 ,, - -	—	—	—	—
	2/6 ,, - -	—	—	—	—
Oats - - - -	23/4 p' barrel	20/6 p' barrel	17/6 p' barrel	16/ p' barrel -	17/ p' barrel.
	23/ ,, - -	20/ ,, - -	17/ ,, - -	15/6 ,, - -	16/9 ,,
	22/9½ ,, - -	19/6 ,, - -	15/ ,, - -	15/ ,, - -	16/ ,,
	22/3 ,, - -	19/ ,, - -	14/6 ,, - -	14/ ,, - -	13/6 ,,
	22/ ,, - -	18/6 ,, - -	14/ ,, - -	13/6 ,, - -	13/3 ,,
	21/6 ,, - -	18/ ,, - -	13/6 ,, - -	12/6 ,, - -	13/ ,,
	20/6 ,, - -	17/6 ,, - -	12/6 ,, - -	12/ ,, - -	12/6 ,,
	20/ ,, - -	17/ ,, - -	12/ ,, - -	11/6 ,, - -	12/ ,,
	19/6 ,, - -	16/6 ,, - -	11/6 ,, - -	11/ ,, - -	11/9 ,,
	19/ ,, - -	16/ ,, - -	11/ ,, - -	10/6 ,, - -	10/6 ,,
	18/6 ,, - -	15/6 ,, - -	13/ ,, - -	10/3 ,, - -	9/3 ,,
	- - -	15/ ,, - -	15/6 ,, - -	10/ ,, - -	—
	- - -	14/6 ,, - -	—	—	—
	- - -	14/ ,, - -	—	—	—
Bran - - - -	6/3 p' barrel -	6/ p' barrel -	5/5 p' barrel -	4/6 p' barrel -	4/6 p' barrel.
	5/6 ,, - -	5/6 ,, - -	5/4 ,, - -	4/4 ,, - -	4/2 ,,
	5/ ,, - -	5/ ,, - -	5/ 4/10	4/3 ,, - -	4/ ,,
	- - -	4/8 ,, - -	4/6 4/4	3/10 ,, - -	3/10 ,,
Potatoes - - - -	£.5 p' ton -	- nil -	£.1. 17. p' ton	- nil -	£.1. 6. 8. p' ton.
Straw - - - -	4/6 p' cwt. -	3/4 p' cwt. -	1/10 p' cwt. -	2/ p' cwt. - -	2/6 p' cwt.
	4/2 ,, - -	3/3 ,, - -	1/6 ,, - -	1/10 ,, - -	2/4 ,,
	3/10 ,, - -	3/2 ,, - -	1/4 ,, - -	1/8 ,, - -	2/2 ,,
	3/8 ,, - -	3/ ,, - -	1/3 ,, - -	1/6 ,, - -	2/ ,,
	3/5 ,, - -	2/10 ,, - -	1/2 ,, - -	1/5 ,, - -	1/11 ,,
	3/ ,, - -	2/8 ,, - -	- - -	1/4 ,, - -	1/10 ,,
	2/6 ,, - -	2/6 ,, - -	- - -	- - -	1/8 ,,
	2/4 ,, - -	2/3 ,, - -	- - -	- - -	1/6 ,,
	2/2 ,, - -	2/2 ,, - -	- - -	- - -	1/4 ,,
	2/ ,, - -	2/ ,, - -	—	—	—
	1/10½ ,, - -	—	—	—	—
	1/10 ,, - -	—	—	—	—
	1/7 ,, - -	—	—	—	—

N° 5.—Account of Prices paid for Materials, &c.—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Harness Materials, *viz.*					
Harness Leather	£. 4. 0. p' hide	£. 5. 6. p' hide	£. 3. 16. 0. p' hide	£. 3. 10. p' hide	£. 3. 12. 6. p' hide.
	3. 14. ,,	4. 11. ,,	3. 8. 3. ,,	3. 5. ,,	3. 8. 3. ,,
	3. 10. ,,	4. 0. ,,	3. 5. 0. ,,	- - -	3. 8. 0. ,,
	2. 18. ,,	3. 12. ,,	- - -	- - -	3. 6. 0. ,,
	1. 8. ,,	3. 5. ,,	- - -	- - -	3. 5. 0. ,,
	- - -	1. 15. ,,	- - -	- - -	3. 4. 0. ,,
	- - -	1. 12. ,,	- - -	- - -	3. 2. 0. ,,
	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	3. 0. 0. ,,
Butt	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	1/11½ p' lb.	1/10 p' lb.
Water deck hides	- nil -	£. 3. 0. p' hide	—	—	—
Horse skin	- - -	1. 8. p' hide	£. 1. 12. p' hide	£. 1. 12. p' hide	£. 1. 8. p' hide.
Sheep skin	- - -	3/4 p' skin	- nil -	2/8½*d.* p' skin	1/11 & 1/9 p' skin.
Basil skin	1/6 p' skin	1/1 p' skin	- - -	- - -	2/6 p' skin.
Saloon hides	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	£. 2. 12. p' hide.
Twine	2/2 p' lb.	2/ & 1/6 p' lb.	2/ & 1/4 p' lb. & 4/ p' ball	2/ & 4/ p' ball	—
Flax	- - -	3/ p' lb.	3/ p' lb.	3/ p' lb.	3/4 & 3/ p' lb.
Hemp	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	2/ p' lb.
Curled hair	1/2 p' lb.	1/3 p' lb.	1/4 p' lb.	1/3 p' lb.	1/3 ,,
	1/1 p' lb.	1/2 ,,	1/1½ ,,	—	—
	- - -	- - -	1/ ,,	—	—
Horse cheek	11/6 & 10/6 p' yd.	12/6 p' yard	12/6 p' yard	12/6 p' yard	12/6 p' yard.
Brass nails	5½*d.* p' hundred	- - -	- - -	- - -	9*d.* & 4½*d.* p' hun.
Crupper chains	1/ & 10*d.* each	- - -	- - -	- - -	7*d.* each.
Saddle trees	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	9/6 each.
Cart hames	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	7/6 p' pair.
Crest plates	- - -	15/4 & 15/ p' doz	- - -	13/ p' dozen	12/. & 10/ p' doz.
Straddle plates	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1/ each.
Bridle - - d°	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1/ each.
Buckles of various sizes	1/11 1/8 1/4 11*d.* 10*d.* & 8*d.* each	1/8 & 1/4 p' doz. & 7/6 p' gross	3*s.* & 8½*d.* p' doz.	- - -	average 3*d.* each.
Breeching links	2/6 & 2/2 p' pair	—	—	—	—
Mouthing bitts	3/3 each	- - -	- - -	- - -	2/9 each.
Watering chains	10*d.* p' pair	—	—	—	—
Materials for Carpentry, *viz.*					
Timber					
Oak	- - -	£. 12. 0. p' ton	- - -	- - -	£. 13 p' ton.
Pine	£. 5. 6. 8. p' ton	5. 10. ,,	£. 4. 10. £. 4. 5. £. 5. & £. 4 p' ton	£. 4. p' ton	£. 5. £. 4. & £. 3. 15. p' ton.
Memel	£. 8. & £. 6. 16. 6.	8. 0. ,,	£. 7. 10. & £. 7. ,,	6. 15. ,,	£. 6. 5. & £. 6. ,,
Memel plank	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	£. 6. - - ,,
Ash	£. 7. 11. 8. p' ton	£. 8. £. 8. 5. £. 7. & £. 6. 8. 4. p' ton	£. 8. 10. p' ton	8. 0. ,,	8. 10. - ,,
Elm	£. 6. 10. 0. p' ton	£. 6. & £. 5 p' ton	£. 7. 10. ,,	7. 0. ,,	7. 10. - ,,
Elm plank	9*d.* p' foot	- - -	- - -	- - -	7½*d.* p' foot.
Norway Timber	£. 5. 10. p' ton	£. 6. 10. p' ton	—	—	—
Swedish d°	7. 10. p' ton	- nil -	—	—	—
Dantzic	8. 0. p' ton	- nil -	—	—	—
Beech	- nil -	£. 7. p' ton	£. 6. 10. & £. 5. p' ton	£. 6. p' ton	—
Riga	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	7. ,,	—
Birch	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	£. 5. p' ton.
Deals	- - -	£. 45. 10. £. 44. £. 38. & £. 36. p' hundred	£. 38. £. 35. & £. 32. p' hund.	£. 39. £. 33. & £. 26. p' hund.	33. p' hund.
Cart felloes	1/8 each	1/8 each	1/ & 8*d.* each	- nil -	1/ each.
Spokes, long and short	1/1 each	1/1 10*d.* & 5*d.* ea.	1/6 1/ & 6*d.* ea.	- - -	10*d.* & 9*d.* each.
D° old	3*d.* each	19/11 16/8 15/ & 13/4 p' hundred	1¾*d.* & 1½ each	1/9 & 1/6 p' doz.	1/6 p' dozen.
Stocks (not turned)	8*s.* p' pair	- nil -	—	—	—
Pick handles	9*d.* each	6*d.* & 4*d.* each	- - -	4½*d.* each	—
Sledge handles	- - -	3*s.* p' dozen	—	—	—
Materials for Smith's work, *viz.*					
Iron British and Foreign bar, and faggotted	24/ p' cwt.	18/ p' cwt	32/ p' cwt.	24/ p' cwt.	32/ p' cwt.
	15/ ,,	17/ ,,	28/ ,,	16/ ,,	17/ ,,
	14/ ,,	16/6 ,,	24/ ,,	15/ ,,	13/ ,,
	13/ ,,	15/ ,,	14/6 ,,	13/6 ,,	11/6 ,,
	- - -	14/6 ,,	14/ ,,	13/ ,,	11/ ,,
	- - -	14/ ,,	13/6 ,,	12/6 ,,	10/6 ,,
	- - -	- - -	12/6 ,,	12/ ,,	10/3 ,,
	- - -	- - -	- - -	11/6 ,,	10/ ,,
	- - -	- - -	- - -	11/ ,,	9/6 ,,
	- - -	- - -	- - -	10/6 ,,	9/3 ,,

(continued.)

N° 5.—Account of Prices paid for Materials, &c.—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.		1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Materials for Smith's work—*continued.*						
Iron	Round	26/ p' cwt.	- - -	15/6 p' cwt.	18/ p' cwt.	20/ p' cwt.
		18/ ,,	- - -	14/ ,,	- - -	16/ ,,
		17/ ,,	nil	- - -	- - -	12/ ,,
		15/6 ,,	- - -	- - -	- - -	11/ ,,
		15/ ,,	- - -	—	—	—
		14/6 ,,	- - -	—	—	—
	Hoop	10/6 p' bundle	21/ p' cwt.	20/ p' cwt.	18/8 p' cwt.	18/ p' cwt.
		22/ p' cwt.	20/ ,,	18/ ,,	18/ ,,	15/ ,,
		20/ ,,	- - -	16/ ,,	16/6 ,,	—
		- - -	- - -	- - -	16 ,,	—
	Sheet	- - -	32/ p' cwt	30/ p' cwt.	28/ ,,	20/6 p' cwt.
		nil	- - -	28/ ,,	25/ ,,	—
		- - -	- - -	26/6 ,,	—	—
	Rod	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	37/4 p' cwt.
		nil	nil	nil	nil	34/ ,,
		- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	32/ ,,
	Steel	70/ p' cwt.	79/4 p' cwt.	79/4 p' cwt.	79/4 p' cwt-	79/4 ,,
		56/ ,,	74/8 ,,	58/ ,,	56/ ,,	65/4 ,,
		50/ ,,	56/ ,,	- - -	- - -	56/ ,,
	Manufactured Articles, *viz.*					
	Shovels	52/ p' dozen	52/ p' dozen	52/ p' dozen	52/ p' dozen	52/ p' dozen
	Spades	52/ ,,	nil	52/ ,,	—	—
	Shovel heads	42/ p' cwt	42/ p' cwt.	nil	42/ p' cwt.	42/ p' cwt.
	Cart boxes	18/ p' pair	18/ p' pair	18/ p' pair	—	—
	Axle arms	24/ p' cwt	—	—	—	—
	Files	2/10 each	3/4 each	3¼ *d.* each	1/6 each	2/4 each
		1/3 ,,	2/10 ,,	1/ ,,	1/2 ,,	1/2 ,,
		10½ *d.* ,,	2/4 ,,	10 *d.* ,,	1/ ,,	—
		6½ *d.* ,,	1/10 ,,	6½ *d.* ,,	—	—
		3 *d.* ,,	1/8 ,,	—	—	—
	Horse rasps	2/11½ each	3/4 each	3/4 each	3/4 each	3/4 each
		2/10 ,,	2/10 ,,	- - -	- - -	1/2 ,,
		- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1/ ,,
	Street labels	2/8½ each	2/8½ each	3/6 each	- - -	3/6 & 2/6 each
	A screw wrench	5/5 each	—	—	—	—
	Barrow steps	37/4 p' cwt.	—	—	—	—
	Lamp post urns	28/ ,,	—	—	—	—
	Hay knife	nil	4/4	—	—	—
	Cart wheels, boxes, caps, and sundry cast iron articles relating to carts	nil	nil	nil	nil	3 *d.* & 2½ *d.* p' lb.
	Metal pump complete	nil	nil	nil	nil	9 *s.* p' foot.
	An anvil	nil	nil	5 *d.* p' lb.	—	—
Bellows		nil	nil	nil	£.6. each	—
Coals (smith's)		31/ p' ton	36/ p' ton	30/ p' cwt.	38/ p' cwt.	38/4 p' cwt.
		30/ ,,	31/ ,,	25/ ,,	35/ ,,	35/7 ,,
		28/ ,,	30/ ,,	24/ ,,	27/ ,,	31/4 ,,
		- - -	28/ ,,	- - -	26/ ,,	27/4 ,,
		- - -	26/ ,,	—	—	—
		- - -	24/ ,,	—	—	—
		- - -	23/ ,,	—	—	—
Nails, p' thousand	4 *d.* clout	4/ & 3/4	3/4	3/4	3/4	3/4
	6 *d.* d°	5/ 4/ & 3/10	4/	4/	4/	4/
	8 *d.* d°	7/4 & 4/6	nil	4/6	4/6	4/6
	10 *d.* d°	nil	5/	—	—	—
	12 *d.* d°	nil	nil	6/6	6/6	6/6
	20 *d.* d°	nil	nil	9/	9/	9/
	2 *s.* - d°	20/	15/ & 11/	11/	nil	11/
	4 *d.* common	nil	nil	nil	3/4	3/4
	6 *d.* d°	3/4 & 3/6	3/6	3/6	3/6	3/6
	8 *d.* d°	6/8 & 4/	4/	4/	4/	4/6
	10 *d.* d°	4/6	nil	—	—	—
	12 *d.* d°	5/6	5/6	5/6	5/6	5/6
	20 *d.* d°	12/6 & 7/6	7/6	7/6	7/6	7/6
	2 *s.* - d°	9/6	9/6	9/6	9/6	9/6
	6 *d.* battins	3/	3/3	3/3	3/3 & 2/6	3/3
	8 *d.* d°	4/	nil	4/	nil	4/
	Spikes	6 *d.* & 7 *d.* p' lb.	5 *d.* p' lb.	5 *d.* p' lb.	5 *d.* p' lb.	4 *d.* p' lb.
	Horse nails	nil	nil	1/1 p' lb.	1/1 p' lb.	—

Nº 5.—Account of Prices paid for Materials, &c.—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Miscellaneous Articles, *viz.*					
White lead	44/ p' cwt.	46/ Brit. p' cwt.	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Red lead	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	5/ p' stone	- nil.
Lamp black	- nil -	10*d.* p' lb.	1/ p' lb. & 10 p' lb.	same as last year	- nil.
Whiting	- nil -	5/4 & 4/ p' cwt.	4/ p' cwt.	- nil -	- nil.
Drying oil	- nil -	6/6 p' gallon	- nil -	5/6 p' gallon	—
Prussian blue	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	12/ p' lb.	—
Harness oil	- nil -	6/ p' gallon	6/4 p' gallon	6/ p' gallon	—
Sweet oil	- nil -	7/ p' gallon	12/ & 8/8 p' gal.	6/ p' gallon	—
Turpentine	- nil -	6/6 p' gallon	6/6 p' gallon	- nil -	—
Tar	- - -	- nil -	32/6 p' barrel	17/ p' cask	—
Pitch - - per barrel	2/2 p' stone & 40/	- 35/ -	- nil -	48/ & 30/ p' barrel	—
Linseed and boiled oil	- nil -	4/9 Brit. p' gal.	- nil -	- nil -	—
Paint brushes - - each	3/4 3/2 & 2/11	- nil -	1/10 & 9/	2/ & 3/	2/6 1/10 & 3*d.*
Cart wheels	£.5. p' pair	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Tallow	92/ p' cwt.	102/8 102/ and 93/4 p' cwt.	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Scavenging carts	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	£.12. 10. 3. each	- nil.
Carts without axles or boxes	- nil -	10 guineas each	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
A 36 feet ladder	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	1/8 p' foot	- nil.
Brooms	1/1 p' dozen	1/1 p' dozen	1/1 p' dozen	1/1 p' dozen	1/1 per dozen.
Stable buckets	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	4/ and 3/4 each	—
Sieves	- nil -	- nil -	- 2/ each -	1/ each	—
Painting street labels	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	1/8 and 1/3 each	same as last year.
Brass cart plate letters	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	1/1 & 1/ each.
Scales, beam and weights	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	12/11.
Sheet copper	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	1/6 p' lb.
Fire bricks	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	12/ p' hundred.
Fire blocks	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	2/ each.
Measuring tapes	- nil -	9/9 each	- nil -	- - -	11/4½ each.
Carpenters Tools, *viz.*					
Planes	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	4/7 3/9 & 6/8 each.
Handsaw	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	7/6.
Hatchet	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	4/2.
Adze	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	4/.
Drawing knife	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	1/8.
Spoke shaver	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	2/6.
Chissels	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	9*d.* 10*d.* 11*d.* & 1/1 ea.
Augers	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	10*d.* 12½*d.* & 1/3 each.
Lime measures	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- - -	16/3 each.
Plumbers Materials, *viz.*					
Lead	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	30/ & 23/4 p' cwt.	30/ & 23/4 p' cwt.
Solder	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	10*d.* p' lb.	10*d.* p' lb.
Pipe, 1 inch	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	1/6 p' foot	1/6 p' foot.
Dº ¾ inch	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	1/4 p' foot	1/4 ,,
Empty sacks	- nil -	- nil -	2/10 each	- nil -	5/ each.
A straw cutter	- nil -	- nil -	£. 9. 2.	- nil -	- nil.
Lanterns	- nil -	- nil -	2/2 & 3/2 each	- nil -	- nil.
Glass	- - -	63/ p' crate	- - -	- nil -	- nil.
Ladder poles	- - -	- - -	2/6 p'	- nil -	- nil.
STATIONERY.					
Sundry official Prints, *viz.*					
License to open streets	30/ & 40/ p' thousand	- nil -	2/8 p' hundred	- nil -	£.15. 10. p' hundred books of 100 leaves each.
Dº to Pipe Water Committee	20/ p' thousand	15/ p' thousand	- nil -	- nil -	£.12. 10. p' dº.
Dº to erect ladders	20/ p' thousand	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Drafts on Treasurer to discharge licence balances	22/ p' thousand	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	£.15. p' hun. books of 100 leaves each.
Orders on Treasurer to receive money	14/2 p' thousand	10/ p' thousand	same as last year	23/ p' thousand	21/6 p' thousand.
Orders on Treasurer to pay money	14/2 p' thousand	10/ p' thousand	same as last year	23/ p' thousand	21/6 p' thousand.
Orders on manure depôts for manure sold	2/9 & 4/ p' hund.	2/6 p' hundred	- nil -	- nil -	- nil.
Report sheets of nuisance inspectors	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	22/6 p' thousand	- nil.
Summonses	2/2 & 4/6 p' hun. and 28/ p' thous.	2/6 p' hundred	28/ p' thousand	28/ p' thousand	4/ p' book, 100 leaves
Notices for dirty footways	- nil -	3/ p' hundred	1/6 p' hundred	- - -	1/3 p' book, 50 leaves
Street lists for inspector's morning abstracts	- nil -	- nil -	£.3. 19. p' thous.	5*l.* 3*l.* 19*s.* & 3*l.* 18*s.* p' thous.	£.3. 19. 4. p' thous.
Reports of flagging executed	- nil -	- nil -	10. 8. p' thous.	£.10. 8. p' thous.	£.11. 6. p' thous.

(*continued.*)

N° 5.—Account of Prices paid for Materials, &c.—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
STATIONERY: Official Prints—*continued.*					
Daily returns of paving and scavenging parties	40/ & 65/ p' thous.	- nil -	56/ p' thousand	56/6 p' thousand	£.2. 17. 6. p' thous.
D° of flagging parties	- nil -	60/ p' thousand	same as last year	same as 1819	- nil.
D° of lighting	40/ & 65/6 p' thous.	54/2 p' thousand	56/6 p' thousand	55/ & 56/6 p' thous.	£. 2. 15. p' thous.
Morning reports of paving and scavenging parties	15/ 16/3 & 16/8 p' thousand	8/ p' thousand	15/ p' thousand	15/ & 14/4 p' thous.	16/3 p' thousand.
Pay sheets of paving and scavenging parties	60/ & 65/ p' thous.	- nil -	56/ p' thousand	56/ & 60/ p' thous.	56/6 p' thousand.
D° lighting	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	55/ p' thousand.
Applications for licences	21/4 p' thousand	- nil -	- nil -	33/ p' thousand	30/ p' thousand.
Orders for payments	42/ & 80/ p' thous.	- nil -	80/ p' thousand	- nil -	£. 3. p' thousand.
Receipts for payments for watering streets	10/ & 5/ p' thous.	9 *d.* book, 25 leaves	1/4 p' book, 50 leaves	- nil -	30/ p' thousand.
Receipts for fines	2/6 p' hundred	1/6 p' hundred	2/6 p' hundred	- nil -	32/6 p' thousand.
D° for general purposes	32/ p' thousand	1/6 p' book, 50 leaves	- nil -	- nil -	- same.
Notices for payment of taxes	16/ & 11/8 p' thous.	- nil -	10/ p' thousand	10/ p' thousand	8/ p' thousand.
Affidavits respecting empty houses	50/ p' thousand	18/ p' thousand	33/4 p' thousand	32/ p' thousand	32/6 p' thousand.
Tax receipts	1/4 p' book, 50 leaves	- - -	1/1 p' book, 50 leaves	1/1 p' book	1/1 p' book, 50 leaves
License receipts	2/9 p' book, 50 leaves	24/ p' thousand	2/ p' hundred	- - -	32/ p' thousand.
Oil sheets	63/4 thousand	same as last year	63/ p' thousand	£. 4. 10. p' thous.	£. 4. p' thousand.
Horse lists	40/ p' thousand	- - -	45/ p' thousand	45/6 p' thousand	30/ p' thousand.
Ticket books	8¼ *d.* p' book, 50 leaves	5 *d.* p' book	5 *d.* p' book	5 *d.* p' book	41/8 p' hundred books, 50 leaves each.
Books, *viz.*					
Tax ledgers	£. 9. 16. 9. for 3	same as last	same as last	same as last	£. 8. 18. for 3.
Tax books for collectors	7. 9. 9. for 23	same as last	£. 2. 15. for 6, & for rem^r same as 1818	same as 1818	£. 11. 4. 8. for 19.
Treasurers ledger	£. 2. 15.	£. 2. 1.	same as last year	same as 1819	- nil.
D° - - cash book	1. 16.	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	- nil.
D° - - deposit book	1. 0.	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Minute book	- nil -	- nil -	£. 8. 18. for 3	- nil -	£. 3. each.
Blotters	45/ p' dozen	- nil -	- nil -	- nil -	42/ p' dozen.
Cart work registry book	- nil -	£. 9. 12. for 2	- nil -	- nil -	£. 4. 12. 0. each.
Lighting book	£. 3. 10.	same as last year	£. 3. 1. 8.	same as last year	3. 12. 0. each.
Scavenging book	- nil -	- nil -	£. 7. 4. 8. for 2	- nil -	3. 9. 8.
Paving book	- nil -	- nil -	7. 4. 8. for 2	- nil -	—
Labourers book	- nil -	- nil -	7. 4. 8. for 2	- nil -	3. 9. 8.
Ledger	£. 7. 2. 9.	- nil -	£. 3. 9.	same as last year	3. 9. 8.
Letter book	- nil -	- nil -	£. 1. 3.	- nil -	1. 7. 0.
Almanacks, double and treble	9/2½ & 11/6 each	8/1½ & 11/11 each	9/4 & 11/4½ each	8/ & 11/4½ each	11/4½ each.
Sheet d°	1/4 each	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	1/4 each.
Memorandum books	14/ & 8/ p' dozen	18/ 8/ & 6/ p' doz.	26/ 18/ 8/ p' doz.	16 p' dozen	8/ p' dozen.
Paper, &c. *viz.*					
Letter, plain - per ream	31/ 25/ 22/ 20/ and 14/9	- 22/9 -	24/ 23/ 22/9	- 23/ -	25/ & 24/.
D° gilt - per ream	- - -	- - -	- 52/ -	- - -	- 40/.
Note - per ream	13/ & 10/6	- 17/ -	- 13/ -	- 18/ -	- 16/.
Propatria, common - per ream	25/ 23/ & 21/	27/ 22/6	24/ & 25/	- - -	23/ & 25/.
D° English - per ream	- nil -	- 30/ -	- 30/ -	36/ & 30/	- 30/.
Post - per ream	- nil -	- 50/ -	- nil -	- nil -	- £. 3.
Blotting - per ream	20/ & 16/6	22/9 & 16/	- 18/ -	18/ & 17/	- 18/.
Brown (large) - per ream	- 18/ -	- - -	- 22/9 -	22/9 & 1/6 p' quire	- 30/.
Quills - per hundred	15/ 8/8 7/6 6/ 5/5 5/ 3/9½ 4/ & 1/8	6/6 6/ 5/ 4/4	10/ 6/6 & 5/6	10/10 8/2 & 5/5	11/ 8/8 & 6/6.
Ink, black - per gallon	- 6/6 -	8/ & 6/6	7/7 & 6/6	7/7 & 6/6	8/8.
D°, red - per gallon	- 14/ -	- 12/ -	—	—	—
Sealing wax	8/8 p' lb.	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	8/ p' lb.
Wafers	6/8 & 6/ p' lb.	4/ & 2/6 p' lb.	4/10 p' lb.	5/ p' lb.	5/ p' lb.
Tape	10/ p' dozen	9/ p' dozen	8/ p' dozen	same as last year	6/ p' doz.
Indian rubber	3/3 p' bottle	4/6 p' bottle	- nil -	- nil -	8 *d.* p' oz.
Pencils	- - -	9/ & 5/ p' dozen	5/ p' dozen	5/ p' dozen	5/ p' doz.
Collectors weekly abstracts	80/ p' thousand	75/ p' thousand	84/2 p' thousand and 76/2	84/2 p' thous.	78/2 p' thous

J. Reily,
Clerk in Department of Supervisors of Works.

Given under our Corporation Seal,
Dublin, 19th May 1823.
W. Little, Sec^y.

N° 6.—AN ACCOUNT of the Prices paid for Day Labour, in each of the last five years.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Overseers or Foremen:—					
Of Paving, Labourers, Sewers, and Flagging	7/8 p' diem	—	—	—	—
	6/5 „	6/5 p' diem	6/5 p' diem	4/4 p' diem	4/4 p' diem.
	5/5 „	5/ „	4/6 „	3/9½ „	3/9½ „
	4/6 „	4/6 „	4/4 „	3/4 „	3/4 „
	4/4 „	4/4 „	4/ „	2/6 „	2/6 „
	4/2 „	4/2 „	—	—	—
	3/9½ „	4/ „	3/9½ „	1/8 „	1/8 „
	3/4 „	3/9½ „	4/2 „	—	—
	2/6 „	3/4 „	3/4 „	—	—
	1/10¾ „	2/6 „	2/6 „	—	—
	1/8 „	1/10¼ „	1/8 „	—	-
	-	1/8 „	—	—	—
Of Scavenging	4/6 „	3/9½ „	4/8 „	4/8 „	—
	3/9½ „	3/4 „	3/9½ „	3/9½ „	—
	3/4 „	2/6 „	3/4 „	3/4 „	3/4 „
	2/6 „	-	2/6 „	2/6 „	2/6 „

The Foremen of Scavengers, with a few exceptions, were reduced to 2*s.* 6*d.* per day, in August 1818.

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Paviors	4/ p' diem	4/ p' diem	same as last year	4/ p' diem	same as last year.
	3/6 „	3/6 „		3/6 „	
	3/4 „	3/4 „		3/4 „	
	3/2 „	3/2 „		3/2 „	
	3/ „	3/ „		3/ „	
	2/10 „	2/4 „		-	
	2/6 „	-		-	
	2/4 „	-		-	
Rammers	2/ „	2/ „	same as last year	same as 1819	same as 1819.
	1/10 „	—	—	—	—
Paving Labourers	1/6 „	same as last year	same as 1818	1/6 to 18 May afterwards 1/4	1/4 p' diem.
Watchmen (including lights)	2/3 p' night	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Stonecutters	3/3 p' diem	3/3 p' diem	same as last year	same as 1819	same as 1819.
	2/ „	—	—	—	—
Labourers of d°	1/8 „	same as last year	same as 1818	1/8 to 19 May afterwards 1/4	1/4 p' diem.
Masons	4/4 „	4/ p' diem	4/4 p' diem	4/ p' diem	4/ „
	4/ „	2/8 „	4/ „	2/8 „	2/8 „
	3/2 „	3/3 „	2/8 „	—	—
	2/8 „	2/6 „	—	—	—
Labourers of d°	2/2 „	same as last year	2/2 to 13 June, afterwards 1/8	1/8 p' diem	same as last year.
Carters for Board Horses	2/2 „	same as last year	2/2 to 26 July, afterw^ds 1/10¾	1/10¾ „	same as last year.
Labourers watering streets	1/8 „	1/8 p' diem	1/6 p' diem	1/4 „	same as last year.
Scavengers, *viz.*					
Cart-fillers	2/ „	same as last year	same as 1818	2/ to 19 May afterwards 1/8	1/8 p' diem.
Sweepers	1/6 to 1st Aug. afterwards 1/2	1/2 p' diem	same as 1819	1/2 to 19 May, afterwards 1/	1/ „
Depôt labourers	same as sweepers	same	same	1/2 to 19 May, from whence to 1 Sept. 1/ afterwards 1/4	1/4 „
Lamp Inspectors, *viz.*					
Divisional	5/6 p' diem, including Sundays	5/6 p' diem	5/6 p' diem	5/6 ⅓ of the year	same as last year.
	3/3 „	3/8½ „	nil	4/1½ ⅔ of d°	
	3/8½ „	-	nil.	—	—
Chief	7/1¼ „	same as last year	same as 1818	7/1¼ ⅓ of the year 5/4¼ ⅔ of d°	same as last year.
Lamplighters learning	1/4½ p' night	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
D° nightmen	1/7½ „	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Persons employed at the Factory:					
Foreman	4/ p' diem to 3 Apr.	nil	nil	nil	nil.
Carpenters	5/ p' diem	5/ p' diem	5/ p' diem	5/ p' diem	5/ p' diem.
	4/8 „	4/8 „	4/8 „	4/8 „	4/8 „
	-	4/4 „	-	4/4 „	1/6* „
Smiths	5/ p' diem	5/ „	5/ p' diem	same as last year	same as 1820.
	3/4 „	3/9½ „	2/10½ „		
	2/10½ „	2/10½ „	-		

* a boy.

(*continued.*)

N° 6.—Account of Prices paid for Day Labour—*continued.*

DENOMINATION.	1818.	1819.	1820.	1821.	1822.
Persons employed at the Factory—*continued.*					
Sawyers	4/4 p' diem	same as last year	same as 1818	4/4 to 3d Aug. afterwards 3/4	3/4 p' diem.
Harness-maker	3/9½ „	same as last year	same as 1818	same as 1818	same as 1818.
Labourers	1/8 „	1/10¾ p' diem	1/6 p' diem	same as last year	1/6 p' diem.
	1/6 „	1/8 „	- - -	- - -	1/ „
	- - -	1/6 „	—	—	—
Hired carts, with pair of horses each, for scavenging	9/ „	same as last year	same as 1818	9/ to 20 April, afterwards 7/	7/ to 15 June, afterwards 7/7.
Pair of horses to draw Board cart	8/ „	same as last year	same as 1818	8/ to 20 April, afterwards 6/	6/ to 15 June, afterwards 6/6.
Hired carts, with pair of horses each, for paving	8/8 „	same as last year	same as 1818	8/8 to 20 April, afterwards 7/	7/ to 15 June, afterwards 7/7.
Hired cart drawn by one horse	5/5 „	same as last year	same as 1818	5/5 to 20 April, afterwards 4/6	4/6 p' diem.

J. Reilly,
Clerk in Department of Supervisors of Works.

Given under our Corporation Seal,
Dublin, 19th May 1823. *W. Little,* Sec^y.

Appendix, N° 6.

REPLY to Charges preferred by Mr. Peter Finnerty, Storekeeper and Superintendent of Artificers to the Paving Board, against Sir Eyre Coote, one of the Commissioners.

Sir, Dublin, February 2d, 1822.

IN pursuance of Mr. Grant's letters, bearing date respectively the 28th November and 10th December 1821, inclosing charges preferred by Mr. Peter Finnerty, storekeeper and superintendent of artificers to the Paving Board, against Sir Charles Coote, baronet, one of the commissioners, and requesting that we should take each of those distinct charges into consideration as soon as convenient, and make strict investigation into all the circumstances connected with them, and report our opinion thereupon, for the information of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant; we commenced the inquiry on the 22d day of December, and having, in the presence of Mr. Finnerty and Sir Charles Coote, and their counsel, examined all the witnesses produced by the parties, and perused various written documents, which were laid before us relating to the charges, we beg to submit to you, for the information of his Excellency, the following Report, as the result of our investigation.

It appears, that from the establishment of the board of commissioners for paving and lighting, &c. under the 47th Geo. 3. cap. 109. Sir Charles Coote was supervisor of works in the northern district of the city, until the 29th of December 1820, a situation of great importance and trust, and which gave him a control and superintendence over the inferior officers and workmen employed by the board; on the above day he was promoted to the situation of commissioner, and at the same time undertook also to discharge the duties of his former situation, without any salary, a union of offices which we beg leave to suggest may not in any event of this inquiry, be advantageous to the public to continue, (though attended with some diminution of expense), as the necessary tendency of it is, to defeat whatever benefit may be supposed to result from the establishment of a distinct check.

Mr. Finnerty has been about six years in the establishment, during which time he has held different offices under the board, which it is unnecessary to advert to, farther than to state, that he acted for about a year as deputy supervisor to Sir Charles Coote, and on the 13th March 1810, he was appointed to the office of storekeeper at Mespil factory, and superintendent of the artificers, which situation he still holds, though from the commencement of these proceedings another person has been appointed to discharge the duties of it.

The Act of Parliament referred to by the charges preferred in the 47th Geo. 3. cap. 109. by the 18th section of which, a distinction appears to be made between the commissioners and their officers and servants, as to the acts by which they would incur the penalties provided by it, but the object or precise extent of this distinction it is not material to dwell on in the present case, as the most material charges preferred against Sir Charles Coote, as far as they have been proved, apply substantially at least, if not as fully, to his conduct as commissioner as well as supervisor.

How far, in either situation he may have brought himself within the operation of that section, we shall hereafter consider; but on this investigation, from the nature of the charges, as well as the directions contained in Mr. Grant's letters, we conceived it to be our

our duty, not to confine ourselves to matter that might be considered strictly as coming within that section, but to inquire into Sir Charles Coote's conduct as a public officer; in reference to those principles by which, independent of the special provisions of this Act, he and every other public officer filling a situation of trust and confidence, is bound by the general law to regulate his conduct.

In this respect we have felt it our duty to consider how far his conduct was calculated to interfere with the utility of the establishment to which he belongs, or to have been prejudicial to the interests of the public service in that department.

In the course of the investigation, some contradictory and suspicious evidence has been laid before us, but we have thrown all such out of our consideration, and have grounded our Report solely upon written documents; the admissions of Sir Charles Coote, and parol testimony wholly unimpeached.

We shall now proceed to state how far any, and which, of the charges have been proved, what has been advanced by way of justification or excuse, and whether any, and what degree of criminality attached to the conduct of Sir Charles Coote.

With respect to the first three charges, we think the facts stated in them, *viz.* "Putting "the artificers employed at the paving board factory, from the manufacture of public "utensils, tools, carts, &c. and employing them at various private works of his own."— "Converting the public property to his own private uses, such as timber, iron, oats, lea- "ther, manure, building materials, &c."—"Having frequently, and on various occasions, "employed the men and horses paid by the public, at his own private works, such as "ploughing, harrowing, rolling his fields, drawing manure, building materials, &c. thereby "keeping them from the public works, and deriving advantage to himself," are clearly and incontestibly proved in every particular; there was scarcely a witness produced before us that did not establish some of them, and indeed Sir Charles Coote's defence amounted to a distinct admission of them. But, in order to appreciate the nature of these charges, and of the defence applied to them, it will be necessary to advert shortly to some of the details of the different establishments of the board for carrying on its works.

The Mespil factory, over which Mr. Finnerty has the superintendence, is the great depôt of carts, harness, &c. and all manufactured implements necessary for the works of the establishment; it also contains the materials for making and repairing the carts, harness, and all implements used by the board in their different works; the manufacture of these articles is there carried on by artificers in the constant employment of the board, and when occasion requires, extra artificers are sometimes employed. At this place also are kept stores of hay, straw, &c.; the whole was under the care and superintendence of Finnerty; it was his duty to keep an account of all materials received and consumed at this depôt, and also of the employment of the artificers, and to make returns thereof to the board.

There are also in this depôt stables, in which about half the horses of the establishment are kept, the rest being at the Board House in Mary-street; Finnerty had no control over the horses or carters, their work was regulated by officers, called overseers of works, who had authority from the supervisors of works to take such horses, &c. as they wanted; an overseer of works is appointed at each of the stables, whose duty it is to make daily returns of the employment of the horses, specifying the particular work of each; the overseer at Mespil for the last four years, was a man of the name of Cuthbert, who has been lately dismissed by the board.

Adjoining to Mespil factory there is another store, called the Mespil flag and stone yard, containing stones, flags, bricks, mortar, &c. and all materials necessary for the stone and mason work of the board; there is an overseer in this yard, (of the name of M'Kenzie), whose duty it is to keep an account of the occupation of the workmen employed in that yard, and of the materials received and given out, and to make returns thereof to the board.

The Mespil factory and the stone yard last described, are situated near the canal, at the end of Leeson-street, adjoining which Sir Charles Coote has had some ground, and on part of which he has been carrying on buildings, during the time specified in the charges, and the rest of this ground (which does not appear to exceed three acres) he has had in grass or tillage.

For the purpose of carrying on those buildings, it appears distinctly, that Sir Charles, during the time specified in the first charge; *viz.* the last three years, has been in the habit of getting materials from the stores at the Mespil factory and from the stone yard, such as timber, stone, flags, bricks, mortar, &c.; that he has also been in the habit of employing the artificers of the board, both at his own houses and the factory, for manufacturing such articles of timber and iron work as he thought fit; the particulars of which will, in a great measure, appear from written documents hereinafter referred to; he has also, during the same time, used the public horses and carters, in drawing materials from the stores to his premises, in ploughing, harrowing, and rolling the land above mentioned, in drawing manure from Brunswick-street to it, and on various other occasions, as he found it convenient, and sometimes at extra hours; he has also received, in the same time, oats from the Mespil stores for his own use, amounting to about forty-four barrels.

His answer to, and the justification of the above statement advanced by him are, that either by money payments, or return of materials in specie, he has made ample compensation to the board and the public for every thing received by him, or that he intended to do so when his accounts should be furnished, and that for this purpose he directed accounts to be kept by Finnerty, the superintendent at Mespil factory, and by Mackenzie, the overseer of the stone yard, of all materials furnished to him from these different depôts, of all work done for him, and of the time of the artificers and labourers employed by him.

This

This answer does not apply to the employment of the horses and carters, of whose time it is admitted that no account was kept, except in the instance of one carter; we shall, therefore, reserve the consideration of the charge relating to the employment of the horses and carters for distinct consideration, and at this part of our Report confine ourselves to the materials and artificers.

That Sir Charles gave directions to M‘Kenzie and Finnerty to keep such accounts as above stated, is very well established; they were frequently repeated, and to enable Finnerty and M‘Kenzie to keep them with greater accuracy, he ordered the men employed by him to make returns to them of the time they were engaged in his work.

In pursuance of these directions he was charged for a short time, by M‘Kenzie, with the value in money of the materials furnished from the stone yard, over which he was overseer; but Sir Charles, shortly after he commenced the practice of drawing materials from this yard, gave directions to M‘Kenzie, that an account only of the quantity of the materials furnished should be kept, and that he should not in future be charged with the value of them, as he would return them in specie, and, accordingly, from that time, the practice has been for Sir Charles to make returns in kind for articles furnished to him from this depôt. It does not appear, however, that M‘Kenzie kept any distinct and separate account of the articles furnished to Sir Charles; but he states, that with the assistance of the memorandums kept by him, as well as by entries in his books, and the returns made by Sir Charles, he is satisfied that every thing has been replaced that was taken before the last year. We directed an account of materials furnished to Sir Charles Coote from this depôt to be made out, from the commencement of M‘Kenzie's superintendance over it, which has been done, and is given in the Appendix N° 19; from this it appears that the materials furnished within the period in question to Sir Charles, from this depôt, when priced, amount to 41 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.*; that all have been returned, except a balance amounting in value to 8 *l.* 6 *s.* 6 *d.* which appears to be still due, but which we have no reason to think he did not intend to pay, or to replace in kind.

With respect to the materials furnished to Sir Charles from Mespil factory, over which Finnerty presided, or the articles manufactured for him there, it appears that Finnerty kept an account, in pursuance of the directions of Sir Charles above referred to, in which he debited Sir Charles with the value of the materials so furnished, except the oats, (which will require a separate consideration, and which we shall take up in a subsequent part of our Report). With respect to the artificers employed at Mespil, the practice appears to have been as follows; Finnerty made daily entries in books kept for the purpose, of the occupation of every man in the employment of the board in the factory; from these he made weekly pay lists which were returned to the board, containing merely the names of the men and the number of days work; the permanent artificers he always returned as having been the whole time in the employment of the board, although, in point of fact, occasionally employed by Sir Charles; but he entered in a private account against Sir Charles the time they had worked for him, with a view to charge him with the amount; it appears, however, that Sir Charles frequently employed these men for a very short time, less than half a day, which was the smallest portion of time the board made a payment for, by sometimes sending for them to his own premises, and at other times getting something executed in the factory, and when these occupations did not exceed an hour, Finnerty states that it was impracticable to keep the accounts accurately, in consequence of his various other occupations, and the impossibility of ascertaining at all times when the men left the yard, and when they returned; however, some such entries of broken time were certainly made against Sir Charles, though, from the evidence supported by the nature of the system itself, it is impossible that they could have been as accurate as should be, even with a view to keep the account justly by the public; however, we have not the least reason to suppose that any omission took place with the privity or concurrence of Sir Charles.

In this way it appears, that during the whole period to which the charges refer, an account was kept by Finnerty against Sir Charles, with more or less accuracy of the materials and manufactured articles furnished to him, and of the artificers employed by him.

Two accounts appear to have been furnished by Finnerty to Sir Charles, during this period, the first account embraced a period from 6th April 1818, to 17th May 1819, and amounted to a sum of 33 *l.* 11 *s.* 10½ *d.* (*See* Appendix N° 1.)

The second account was from the 30th July 1819, to the 9th February 1821. (*See* Appendix, N° 2.)

No account appears to have been furnished subsequent to this second one, but it appears that within the two or three months immediately preceding the commencement of the inquiry, Sir Charles made frequent applications to Finnerty for this account, for withholding which Finnerty alleges as reasons; first, the impossibility of making it out accurately, from Sir Charles having interfered more than usually, since the period of the last account, with the men himself, and employing them without giving notice to Finnerty; and secondly, his determination of preferring the charges he has done. Since the commencement of the inquiry, Sir Charles has had the account of this subsequent period, from 13th February 1821, to 21st November 1821, drawn out from the books kept by Finnerty, and it appears to amount, including the oats, to 47 *l.* 5 *s.* These three accounts, therefore, amount to a gross total of 121 *l.* 9 *s.* 10 *d.* to which is to be added M‘Kenzie's account, amounting to 41 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.* making, in the whole, the sum of 163 *l.* 2 *s.* 4 *d.* and to that extent, the fact is undeniable, that Sir Charles received materials or employed the workmen of the board; no doubt, however, with the intent to pay for them.

Of the accounts above alluded to connected with the Mespil factory, the first only has been

been paid, and that by a credit for manufactured articles, which, however, appear to have been fairly valued; the second Sir Charles says he has not paid, in consequence, as he states, of some over charges, which had not been corrected; and the third not having been furnished as required, he states, was the only reason of its not having been paid.

Supposing, however, these accounts to have been kept with the utmost accuracy, so that the public could not lose, in point of money, by the system above described, we think it extremely objectionable, and that it should upon no account be permitted to continue.

The first general observation that occurs is, that these accounts never came before the board; this system of dealing does not appear to have been carried on with the sanction, or even with the knowledge of the board, for although an entry of the first of these accounts appears on the books of the board, it was made by the treasurer, at the instance of Sir Charles, but without the privity or direction of the board; there was nothing, therefore, to ensure the accuracy or fairness of the accounts, but the fidelity of the two inferior officers who kept the account, and the superior against whom it was kept, upon which alone they should never depend. This system also led directly to a breach of all the useful checks established by the board, for the prevention of fraud in its subordinate officers.

With respect to the workmen, this appears from the statement already made; the return of their employment were necessarily on the face of them incorrect; they were returned as working for the board, at times when they were working for Sir Charles; and as to the materials, the quarterly returns to the board merely stated, so much "consumed," and this head included what has been used by Sir Charles, as well as by the public, without any distinction; so that by them the officer making the return was discharged, and there was nothing to direct the attention of the board to what had been furnished to Sir Charles, or to the fact that such a practice existed. Indeed this instance may also serve to show, that these returns are in form much too general for any useful purpose; another observation which we feel it our duty to make is, that these private accounts never appeared in those furnished to the commissioners of imprest accounts, and Sir Charles never was returned in them, as a debtor to the establishment, which should have been done, in pursuance of the Act of Parliament.

The officer who prepared the board account, stated to us the reason of this omission to have been, that he did know of the existence of any such debt, which was the inevitable consequence of the system pursued; and we cannot avoid observing, that Sir Charles himself was a commissioner at the time of making up and passing the accounts closed on the 5th January 1821.

The system was further objectionable in another point of view; the establishment of the board was not greater than was requisite for its own purposes, and it frequently happened that they had to employ occasional workmen; the interference of Sir Charles, therefore, with the labourers and artificers, must have naturally obstructed and delayed the public works, and of this consequence there is the clearest evidence, particularly in the smiths department, both as to the effect generally, and as to particular instances, when they were taken off from urgent business for the board, to some work for Sir Charles's private use.

We also think the example set to the inferior officers extremely mischievous, and which must have necessarily weakened Sir Charles's proper authority over them, either as supervisor or commissioner, in case of their attempting to derive similar advantages from their respective situations.

However, in the preceding observations, which are founded upon general, but, as we conceive, wholesome and necessary principles, we do not mean to impute any deliberately corrupt motive to Sir Charles Coote; on the contrary, we think it was his intention to have indemnified the public for every benefit he received; but it was a practice leading to such mischievous consequences, that no indemnity would be a compensation.

The next subject of consideration is, the use of the horses and carts of the board, with the consequent employment of the carters who attended them.

It has been already stated, that Sir Charles has been in the habit of using the horses, carts and carters of the establishment, within the last three years, for all purposes that he found convenient, and sometimes before their regular working hours in the morning; of this work no account whatever has been kept, except in the instance of a single carter, of the name of Armstrong, who appears to have been employed by Sir Charles for a continuance of twenty days at one time, and forty at another, for both which periods he has been charged in one of the accounts above alluded to; but no account appears to have been kept of the employment of the carters for lesser periods, nor of the horses in any instance.

The answer given by Sir Charles in justification of his conduct, in reference to this charge is, that his own horses have been frequently employed by the board at public works, and that in this way he made full compensation for any use he made of the horses of the establishment; even supposing this to be in principle an answer to the charge, it is impossible, from the circumstance of there having been no account kept of the time Sir Charles used the board horses, for us to say with precision whether he has made an adequate return.

It appears that his horses worked for the board altogether, within six years, about twenty months. What proportion this bore to the time he used the board horses, we cannot say, for the reasons above stated; but supposing it to have considerably exceeded the time he used the board horses, (which, if we were to form a conjecture, we should think was the case,) it is to be observed, that Sir Charles's horses were kept at the public stables, while they were so used; and therefore, for any given period of time, for which compensation in work was to be made in this way, the public was at the expense of double forage. The board feeding their own horses, while they were doing work for Sir Charles, and his horses while they were making compensation. Our investigation into this head, led to the production of a document in evidence, by an officer of the name of Nevin, who is at the head of the horse department in both districts, which we think it right to advert to.

The document was an account made out by Nevin, to show the value of the work of Sir Charles Coote's horses, by allowing so much a day as hire, and deducting the expense of feeding, shoeing, &c. This account appeared, however, on a scrutiny, to be totally inconsistent with the evidence of Nevin, given on a former day; and we regret to state, that when asked for an explanation of such inconsistency, he could give none, and we cannot help thinking that there was a corrupt intention on his part to deceive us, with respect to the value of the return made by Sir Charles for the work of the board horses; we think it our duty to advert to this circumstance, for the purpose of bringing into consideration the conduct of an officer filling a place of so much trust as that held by Nevin.

But supposing the fact to be established, and we are disposed to say, that it may on the whole, fairly be presumed, that Sir Charles made compensation to the public, in the way adverted to, for the use of the board horses and men; the practice is one so objectionable that we humbly conceive nothing of this sort ought to sanction its continuance. In proof of this, we have to state amongst other evil consequences, that it leads at once to a gross violation of a very wholesome regulation of the board.

It is the duty of the overseer of the stables, to make a daily return to the board of all the horses, stating the number at work, the particular work of each, and those that remained in the stables from sickness, or any other cause. Until about a year ago, one item in the return, specifying the work was "Sunday Works." Under this general head, the horses employed by Sir Charles Coote, were always returned, until the form was changed in pursuance of an order of Major Taylor, directing the general item to be omitted, and the work to be specified. The form of return was changed in pursuance of that order; notwithstanding which, no return has ever been made of any horse employed by Sir Charles; so that since that order, whenever Sir Charles has employed the horses, the overseer must have given a direct falsehood under his hand in the return, by specifying some public work, at which the horses employed by Sir Charles, were returned as engaged.

Whether these false returns were made in pursuance of any particular directions, we are not satisfied; the evidence relating to this point being such, as we do not think it right to rest such a charge upon; but it is obvious that they were a natural consequence of the system, and that Sir Charles, if he ever saw these returns at the board, must have known them to be false.

However, Sir Charles states in further justification in respect to this charge, that he was fully sanctioned by a report made upon a former inquiry into this establishment, by which he states that a similar practice met with the sanction of those to whom that inquiry was committed; this report we have called for, but upon search made at the secretary's office in the Castle, it could not be found, so that we cannot say how far he is supported in his assertion by it, and we have been left to form our own opinion on the subject, which we have submitted accordingly.

The last subject that requires particular observation is, the oats delivered from the stores at Mespil factory to Sir Charles Coote for his private use, between August 1818 and November 1821; the quantity amounts to 44 barrels 11 stone, and though regular entries have been made of it in Finnerty's private books, and in the ledger kept in his office, yet it has not been brought into the above-mentioned accounts furnished by him to Sir Charles Coote, nor has he paid for any part of it, either in money or by a return in kind. The reason of the omission in the accounts furnished, has not been brought clearly before us on the evidence; but it appears, that five barrels had been furnished during the period of the first account, which had been balanced and settled, and no charge entered for the oats.

Twelve barrels 10 stone, appear to have been furnished during the period of the second account, yet not brought into it; and 27 barrels 1 stone since the closing of that account. No reason has been assigned for the omissions, though the reason given by Sir Charles, for not paying the second account, was an overcharge against him. It appears, however, that in directing Finnerty to make out his account within the last two or three months, he directed him to charge the oats and every thing else. It thus appears, that Sir Charles has been a debtor to the establishment, since August 1818; and of this he has given no explanation whatever, except, that it was his intention to pay for every thing he got; and that as accounts were kept, the public could not lose.

However, taking all the circumstances of this part of the case into consideration, we do not think there was any corrupt intention on the part of Sir Charles Coote, to defraud the public, by converting the property to his own use without making compensation, although the neglect of payment was calculated to incur just suspicion; and strongly marks the evil tendency of the system pursued, and the necessity of putting an end to all interference on the part of the commissioners or their officers, with the public property for their own use. It is an abandonment of the trust with which they are clothed; and without the possibility of any public benefit arising from it, must in general, terminate (let the precautions be what they may) in public loss and detriment.

With respect to the other charges, one of them, *viz.* Nº 10, is merely an example of the first two; and none of them we think, have been established in evidence, nor do we believe they are true; in fact, at the same time we do not mean to say, that they were frivolous and vexatious, or that the prosecutor's conduct, in preferring them with the others, was such as to deserve censure; on the contrary, we think he has done a great public benefit, and what will tend to prevent in future, a system highly to be disapproved of.

We have now stated the results of the evidence laid before us, how far any, and which of the charges have been established, in point of fact, againt Sir Charles; what he has offered in answer or extenuation; how far his conduct and motives, in reference to them, have been corrupt; and it now remains, in pursuance of our instructions, to state how far we think he has brought himself within the section of the Act of Parliament referred to in the early part of the report, or in other respects has been legally culpable; and whilst we do justice to the private motives of the individual, and fully exculpate him from the design of taking any benefit to himself, without ultimately making compensation to the public, we feel ourselves bound to say, that there has, notwithstanding, been a violation of the terms and spirit of the Act of Parliament, as well as an infringement of those principles by which a public officer must ever be held bound; but, at the same time, that we do not shrink from expressing our humble judgment on these points, it is a great satisfaction to us, in a case where the consequences may be so penal, that his Excellency may have more able advice to guide his judgment on the subject.

Annexed is an Appendix, containing copies of the charges and the evidence laid before us, all of which, we have the honour of submitting to you, for his Excellency's consideration.

(A true copy.) *W. Gregory.*

Thomas Lefroy,
James T. Hall.

To the Right honourable Henry Goulburn,
&c. &c. &c.

Appendix N° 7.

LETTER from the Right honourable Henry Goulburn to Sir Charles Coote, Bart.

Sir, Dublin Castle, 31st October 1822.

THE Lord Lieutenant has had under his consideration the report of Mr. Lefroy and Mr. Hall, to whom had been referred the investigation of the charges preferred against you by Mr. Peter Finnerty. His Excellency has also had before him, the* memorials which you have subsequently addressed to him in vindication of your character and conduct.

I am sorry to be under the painful necessity of acquainting you, that the result of his Excellency's consideration of these documents, is a conviction that you have violated the terms and spirit of the Act of Parliament, by which the board of commissioners for paving and lighting the city of Dublin was established; and that his Excellency has therefore no alternative, but that of superseding your appointment as a commissioner of the board.

I am, &c. (signed) *Henry Goulburn.*

(A true copy) *W. Gregory.*

* *These Documents are not forthcoming; if they should be hereafter found, they shall be communicated to the Committee.*

Appendix N° 8.

LETTER from the Right honourable Henry Goulburn to the Commissioners of Paving.

Gentlemen, Dublin Castle, 6th November 1822.

THE Lord Lieutenant has had under his consideration, the report of the investigation of the charges preferred against Sir Charles Coote by Mr. Peter Finnerty, and also the memorials which were subsequently addressed to his Excellency by Sir Charles Coote, in vindication of his conduct; and it appearing to his Excellency, upon consideration of these documents, that Sir Charles Coote has violated the terms and spirit of the Act of Parliament, by which the board of commissioners of paving and lighting the city of Dublin was established, his Excellency is left no alternative but that of superseding the appointment of Sir Charles Coote as a commissioner of the board.

I am, &c. (signed) *Henry Goulburn.*

Appendix, N° 9.

AN ACCOUNT of all Sums paid by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Paving Board, under the Acts in force for paving and lighting the city of Dublin; together with a Return of the Amount payable by the Corporation of Dublin under those Acts, and the Arrears of Composition now remaining due from the Corporation.

	£.	s.	d.
COMPOSITION for PAVING:			
Amount payable by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. for 16 years, commencing 25th March 1807, and ending 25th March 1823, pursuant to the 49th section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being at the rate of £. 300 per annum - - - - - - - - - - - -	4,800	-	-
Of which payment has been received for 14 years to 25th March 1821 - -	4,200	-	-
BALANCE due on 25th March 1823, is - - - £.	600	-	-
COMPOSITION for PAVING round St. Stephen's Green:			
Amount payable by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. for 16 years, commencing 25th March 1807, and ending 25th March 1823, pursuant to the 49th section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being at the rate of £. 50 per annum - - - - - - - - - - - - -	800	-	-
Of which, payment has been received for 15½ years to 29th September 1822 -	775	-	-
BALANCE due on 25th March 1823, is - - - - £.	25	-	-
COMPOSITION for LIGHTING:			
Amount payable by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. for 16 years, commencing 25th March 1807, and ending 25th March 1823, pursuant to the 50th section of 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. being at the rate of £. 20 per annum - - - - - - - - - - - - -	320	-	-
Of which payment has been received for 14 years to 25th March 1821 - -	280	-	-
BALANCE due on 25th March 1823, is - - - - £.	40	-	-
COMPOSITION for CLEANSING:			
Amount payable by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. for 16 years, commencing 25th March 1807, and ending 25th March 1823, pursuant to 51st section 47 Geo. 3. c. 109. at the rate of £. 2,000 per annum - - - - - - - - - - - - -	32,000	-	-
Of which payment has been received for 11 years, to 25th March 1818 - -	22,000	-	-
BALANCE due 25th March 1823, is - - - - - £.	10,000	-	-
For PAVING over Pipe Water Works:			
Amount payable by the Corporation of the city of Dublin to the Commissioners for Paving, &c. for repairs of pavement over openings made in the streets, for pipe water works, commencing the 25th March 1807, and ending 25th March 1823 -	17,506	7	2½
Of which payment has been received for - - - - - - - - - - -	17,255	2	8½
BALANCE due on 25th March 1823, is - - - - £.	251	4	6

GENERAL ABSTRACT OF BALANCES,

Remaining due on 25th March 1823.

	£.	s.	d.
For composition for paving - - - - - - - - - - - - -	600	-	-
D° - - for paving round St. Stephen's Green - - - - - -	25	-	-
D° - - for lighting - - - - - - - - - - - -	40	-	-
D° - - for cleansing - - - - - - - - - - -	10,000	-	-
For paving over pipe water works - - - - - - - - - - -	251	4	6
TOTAL - - - - - - - - £.	10,916	4	6

James Hendrick, Treasurer.

Dublin, 23d May 1823. } Given under our Corporation Seal,

W. Little,
Secretary.

Appendix, N° 10.

AN ACCOUNT of the Amount of Royal Exchange for the Year 1822.

	Amount.
YEAR Ended 5th January 1823 - - - (Irish Currency) - - -	£. 1,856. 5. 10.

Note.—THE above sum is the produce of 2/6 British, upon each Import and Export Entry passed in the Port of Dublin, for the period above stated; 6 *d.* thereof applicable to the Trustees of the Royal Exchange, the remainder to the Corporation of the Corn Exchange.

Custom House Dublin, 29th April 1823. }

Robᵗ Thoˢ Mahony,
for the Examʳ of Customs.

Appendix, N° 11.

AN ACCOUNT of the Salaries and Emoluments of the Officers and Servants of the General Penitentiary, at Milbank.

		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
SUPERIOR OFFICERS, Not residing in the Prison:							
Secretary, Cashier and Accountant		400	–	–			
Medical Superintendent		200	–	–	600	–	–
Residing in the Prison, and have, besides their Salaries, an allowance of Coals:							
Chaplain		400	–	–			
Governor		600	–	–			
Surgeon		400	–	–			
Matron		250	–	–			
Master Manufacturer, with per centage of ½*d.* in the shilling on the prisoners earnings		200	–	–			
Steward		200	–	–	2,050	–	–
INFERIOR OFFICERS, Male Department, who have, besides their Salaries, Rations, and per centage on Prisoners earnings:							
Taskmasters, one for each pentagon	4 a' 60*l.*	240	–	–			
Assistant d° – d°	4 „ „	240	–	–			
Turnkeys, five for each pentagon	20 a' 50*l.*	1,000	–	–	1,480	–	–
With Rations, but not per Centage:							
Turnkeys for infirmaries	2 a' 50*l.*	100	–	–			
Cooks	2 „ „	100	–	–			
Baker	1 - -	60	–	–			
Machine keepers	2 a' 50*l.*	100	–	–			
Millers	2 „ „	100	–	–	460	–	–
Female Department, with Rations, but not per Centage:							
Deputy Matron		100	–	–			
Turnkey for laundry		50	–	–			
Nurses for infirmaries	2 a' 50*l.*	100	–	–			
Cook	1 - -	40	–	–	290	–	–
Having Rations and per Centage:							
Taskmistresses, one to each pentagon	2 a' 60*l.*	120	–	–			
Assistant d° – d°	2 „ „	120	–	–			
Turnkeys, six for each pentagon	12 a' 50*l.*	600	–	–	840	–	–
SERVANTS, with Rations:							
Porters for gates	3 a' 50*l.*	150	–	–			
Messenger	1 „ „	50	–	–			
Serjeant Patrole	1 - -	60	–	–			
Five Patroles	5 a' 50*l.*	250	–	–	510	–	–
TOTAL - - - £.		-	-	-	6,230	–	–

In the Master-manufacturer's office, there are two clerks and a warehouseman, and he also employs a clicker to cut out shoes, and a person to cut out clothes; but these officers have no connection whatever with the prison, and their salaries or wages are paid entirely out of the profits on manufacture.

There are also Gardeners employed to cultivate the garden, but they are not employed in any other way, nor are any prisoners employed in the garden. The value of the garden stuffs consumed more than repays their wages; they have no rations, nor do they lodge in the prison.

An Engine-man is likewise employed to attend the apparatus for warming the female pentagons, at 27*s.* per week, besides extra wages if employed at unusual hours; he has no lodging provided him, nor rations.

There is also one guinea per week paid to a person as Clerk of the Works, similar to what is denominated a labourer in trust in other public buildings, to superintend any repairs that may be necessary, and arrange the tradesmen's bills for such repairs; a portion only of his time is employed for this sum for the benefit of the establishment.

A Schoolmaster is in contemplation and rules framed for regulating his duties, but neither the appointment nor salary are yet finally settled.

Rob. Auld, Sec^y.

Appendix Nº 12.

ACCOUNT of the Expenses for Medical Attendance at Newgate, Giltspur-street, and Borough Compter, for one Year.

His Majesty's Gaol of Newgate, 3d May 1823.

THE Expenses for medical attendance at Newgate, Giltspur-street, and Borough Compter, including medicines, is £.500. per year: the three prisons attended by the same surgeon.

The average number of prisoners in Newgate last year was 304; but the total number committed here was 2,185.

Jnº Wontner, Keeper.

Appendix Nº 13.

RETURN of the Number of Prisoners committed to the Cold Bath Fields Prison, during the last Year, and of the Surgeon's Salary.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields, 3d May 1823.

THE Number of prisoners committed to the Cold Bath Fields prison, during the last year, is 4,398; and the average number of prisoners daily in the said prison, 596.

Surgeon's salary	£.150
A gratuity for long service	50
	£.200 per annum.

Out of which, the surgeon provides all medicines.

I hereby certify that the above account is correct.

John Vickery, Governor.

Appendix, Nº 14.

AN ACCOUNT of the Medical Expenses of the General Penitentiary at Milbank during the Year 1822, from 1st January to 31st December, both inclusive.

MEDICINES, &c.		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Medicines		77	7	8			
Leeches	357	8	13	6			
Cupping		–	7	–			
Bladders	6	–	4	6			
Syringe	1	–	–	8			
Trusses	3	1	4	–			
Bougie	1	–	1	–			
Bandage	1	–	3	6			
Blister cloths	12	–	3	–			
Tape	64 pieces	–	2	10			
Silk	1 skein	–	–	3			
Calico	122 yards	3	11	–			
Flannel	2 pieces and 1 yard	4	–	9			
Sweet oil	20 flasks	1	19	–			
Lard	20½ lbs.	–	15	4½			
					98	14	–½
EXTRA INFIRMARY DIET:							
Arrow root		1	2	6			
Sago		1	4	–			
Fruit		–	13	9			
Sugar	308 lbs.	7	14	–			
Tea	56 ,,	19	12	–			
Milk	2,057 pints	20	17	10½			
White bread		1	5	11¼			
Rice	2½ lbs.	–	1	1¼			
Butter	5½ ,,	–	6	2			
Cheese	1¼ ,,	–	1	–½			
Eggs	238	–	18	1½			
Flour	30 lbs.	–	6	3			
Fish		1	11	10			
Mutton	2,237 lbs.	40	8	1½			
Beer	684 pints	6	13	6			
Brandy	7 ,,	1	12	8			
Wine	44 bottles	8	15	4			
					113	4	2¾
Amount of Infirmary Expenses				£.	211	18	3¼

N. B.—The usual prison diet, to such of the patients in the infirmary as were allowed the same, either on full or reduced allowance of such food, is not included in the above account of infirmary expenses.

SALARIES, &c. connected with the Medical Department; *viz.*

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Principal medical superintendent	-	-	-	200	–	–
Resident surgeon	400	–	–			
Allowance of coals, eight chaldrons	20	–	–			
D° - firewood	1	–	–			
D° - for night lamp	2	2	–			
				423	2	–
Two nurses for female infirmaries, at £. 50	100	–	–			
Two turnkeys for male - d°	100	–	–			
				200	–	–
Rations to these four officers				43	–	–
TOTAL - £.				866	2	–

Average Number of Convicts in the General Penitentiary during the year 1822, was

Of Males	417
Females	330
TOTAL	747

Of that number, there were in the infirmaries during the year;

Of Males	13
Females	18
TOTAL	31

Extracted from the books of the Establishment by, *Rob. Auld,*
Secretary and Accountant.

Appendix, N° 15.

RETURNS from the Convict Establishment in the HULKS.

	YEARS 1819.	1820.	1821.
Average number of prisoners daily on board the different hulks, in the years 1819, 1820, and 1821	2,761	2,885	2,868
Expense of victualling each healthy convict per diem, in the years 1819, 1820, and 1821	11½*d.*	11½*d.*	10¾*d.*
D° - - - each sick convict in the years 1819, 1820, and 1821	1*s.* 5*d.*	1*s.* 5*d.*	1*s.* 3*d.*
Expense of cloathing each convict, in the years 1819, 1820, and 1821	£.3. 17. 6.	£.3. 17. 6.	£.3. 12. 8.
The sums voted in Parliament for the support of the convict establishment, for the years 1819, 1820, and 1821	£.74,932	£.83,675.	£.90,532

Salary paid to Surgeons employed in the Convict Establishment, *viz.*
Four at 200*l.* per annum each, exclusive of medicines,—and
One at 50*l.* per annum, exclusive of medicines.
N. B.—No other medical officer employed.

Salary paid to Chaplains; *viz.*
Four at 200*l.* per annum each,—and
One at 50*l.* per annum.

Appendix N° 16.

ACCOUNT of the Medical Expenses of the Prison at Horsemonger-lane, during the last Year.

THE surgeon receives a salary of £. 75. per annum, for which sum he finds medicine and gives his attendance daily.

ACCOUNT of the average number of persons confined in the prison at Horsemonger-lane, during the last Year.

About 170.

County Gaol of Surrey, 5th May 1823. *J. Walter,* Keeper.

Appendix N° 17.

PAPER respecting the Cork local Act, which compels the sale of Coal by weight.

THE statements made, with respect to the effects said to be produced by the Cork local Act, which compels the sale of coal by weight, is altogether founded in error.

It has been said, that the Cork Act does not answer the expectations formed of it.

The fact is precisely otherwise; it has given most general satisfaction. The only persons who question its propriety, are those, whose complaining most strongly proves the benefit of the Act. Persons who were in the habit of defrauding the buyers, by making the coal which came to their hands at one measurement, greatly exceed that measurement by breaking it into small coal, and by the manner of measuring. The fair sellers, and the buyers, are both equally pleased at the adoption of weight for measure.

By way of confirming the statement, it has been said, that " the Cork people were " *formerly* in the habit of getting Whitehaven coals; they now get *Maryport,* which is " the worst description of coals."

I rather think that Newport, and not Maryport, must have been meant; but in either case, the suggestion is equally unfounded.

What is meant by *formerly,* it is hard to guess. About twenty years ago, Cork was chiefly supplied with coals from *Whitehaven,* Workington, and *Maryport.*

Shortly after that period, the Newport coals were introduced, and were so much more approved of, that the importation of the others rapidly declined, and for the last fifteen years, Cork has been almost exclusively supplied with Newport coals.

There has been no change in this respect since the passing of the Cork Act, which has been in force *only since October last.* There seems not any probability that there will be any change, nor is there any rational cause for making a change.

It has been said, that the consumers *not having it in their power to go to ships,* are obliged to go to factors, and the coals *have been much dearer since that Act.*

Some years back, it was discovered by the owners of vessels, that much time was lost by making the vessels stores for the retail of coals, and they preferred, *and introduced, the habit of selling their cargoes at once to factors, who retailed them.* Of late years therefore, *the habit of selling coals by retail, from vessels, has scarcely been practised at all.*

The consequences, however, have been injurious, for as the rent of stores was much less than the expenses attending the keeping the vessel and her crew, and as a vessel was thus enabled to discharge in two days, which otherwise would be kept for weeks, the price of coals was considerably diminished.

One fact is worth twenty arguments.—The captain of one Newport vessel, in consequence of being able to discharge her cargo thus rapidly, made seven voyages in the months of April and May, three of which, at most, he would only have been able to accomplish under the old system.

The practice of selling coals by weight, prevailed before the Act, with those who were in the habit of giving consideration to the subject, the making it compulsory to sell, generally, in that way, was adopted, in order that the benefit of that mode of purchase should be extended to those who were too ignorant to think for themselves.

To attribute such effects as have been suggested, to an Act in operation but a few months, is, on the face of it, absurd; but how will the case appear when it is stated, that coals have not been for several years back, so cheap as they were since the Act has been in operation.

They did not exceed twenty-two shillings the ton during the whole winter, a price unprecedented, of late years, for *cheapness.*

The representations contained in this paper, will, if necessary, be proved by hundreds, nay, by thousands of the inhabitants of Cork.

Appendix, N° 18.

AN ACCOUNT of all Sums of Money collected by the Corporation of Dublin, under the 49th Geo. 3. c. 80. on account of Metal Main Pipes; and also, an Account showing the application of same for the year 1822; and distinguishing any Reduction or discontinuance of payments, which have been made in consequence of the disallowances of the Commissioners of Accounts in 1817.

CHARGE:	£.	s.	d.
Collected on account of Metal Main, from 29th Sept. 1821 to 29th Sept. 1822 -	9,542	11	10
DISCHARGE:			
Paid off 41 Debentures, from 29th Sept. 1821 to 29th Sept. 1822 -	4,100	–	–
Interest on - - d° -	123	–	–
Paid interest on Debt to 25th March 1822 -	4,665	10	–
£.	8,888	10	–

IN this Account, £.2,500 per annum, as rent for the water-course has not been charged; and the following Salaries for officers have been discontinued in this Account, but have been charged in the Pipe Water Account; *viz.*

	£.	s.	d.	
Richard Cave	150	–	–	per ann.
Andrew Coffey	150	–	–	d°.
Hugh Crofton	100	–	–	d°.
Richard Crofton	60	–	–	d°.
Wilson Tomey	50	–	–	d°.
Richard Quinton	50	–	–	d°.
	£.560	–	–	

An ACCOUNT of all Sums of Money collected by the Corporation of Dublin, for Pipe Water Tax, during the year 1822; and also an Account showing the application of same.

				£.	s.	d.
CHARGE:						
Collected from 29th September 1821 to 29th September 1822				9,733	13	11
Old Pipes				8	7	1½
£.				9,742	1	–½
DISCHARGE:						
Cash paid the Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on gross receipts of Pipe Water Revenue, ending 24th June 1822				1,299	7	1
D° – d° – per centage on £.252. 14. 11. received last year from Commissioners of Paving, for watering the streets				31	11	10
D° – paid Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on gross receipt of the Pipe Water Revenue North Side, ending 24th June 1822				660	6	4½
D° – Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills, for laying down pipes, labourers, &c. &c.				1,184	13	5½
D° – Taaffe and Donohoe, contractors, amount weekly bills for excavating, or in laying down mains, &c.				752	19	11
D° – Commissioners of Paving, paving over metal mains				781	17	4
SALARIES:						
Lord Mayor, one year ending 29th Sept. 1822, in lieu of poundage	£.500	–	–			
Treasurer – – like	500	–	–			
Allen and Greene, secretaries	200	–	–			
Richard Cave, supervisor	350	–	–			
Andrew Coffey, engineer	400	–	–			
Hugh Crofton, storekeeper	200	–	–			
Richard Crofton, overseer	180	–	–			
Wilson Tomey, overseer and measurer	150	–	–			
Richard Quinton, inspector of Turncocks	140	–	–			
Mrs. Quinton, housekeeper	34	2	6	2,654	2	6
RENT and TAXES:						
One year's Rent, Pipe Water House	100	–	–			
D° – – Basin, James-street	20	–	–			
D° – – Part of – d°	8	–	–			
D° – – Basin-lane	9	17	6			
D° – – Allowance of house rent to A. Coffey	28	8	8			
D° – D° – Hugh Crofton	24	–	–			
D° – D° – Richard Crofton	25	–	–			
D° – D° – Wilson Tomey	25	–	–			
Sundry Taxes, and Insurance of Pipe Water House	81	5	–¾	321	11	2¾
TRADESMEN'S BILLS:						
Cash paid Thomas Hughes, iron pipes	£.1,925	19	6½			
D° – Moses Drake, for lead	316	7	10½			
D° – Charles Gibbons, smiths work	44	3	10½			
D° – H. Fawcett, smiths work	9	8	7			
D° – James Fegan, timber	47	–	3			
D° – Charles Hodgens, ropes and yarn	21	15	6			
D° – Messrs. Whiteford and Co. for coals	26	11	8			
D° – Mrs. Watson, books for collectors	45	–	10½			
D° – Richard Cave, cash paid by him for stamps	81	13	4			
D° – George Faulkiner, printing	10	12	–			
D° – Charles Thorpe, painting	15	–	–			
D° – Luke Sibthorpe, glazing	3	9	1½			
D° – William Mallet, smiths work	57	14	4½			
D° – R. Jackson, tallow	10	15	–½			
D° – Messrs. Green and Whister, their account	39	–	2			
D° – J. Wilson, for slating	5	3	3½			
D° – Thomas M'Cready, his account	19	3	3	2,648	18	5¼
£.				10,335	8	2½

Appendix, N° 18—*continued.*

An ACCOUNT of the Funded Debt of the Corporation of Dublin, for supplying the city of Dublin with Water, and for laying down Metal Main Pipes, and the Progress of the Fund as directed to be executed for the liquidation of the same, by the Act of the 49th Geo. 3. c. 80. s. 13. up to the latest period to which the same can be made out.

£.	s.	d.	
32,900	–	–	5 per cent.
40,100	–	–	6 per cent.
73,000	–	–	Old Debt.
32,200	–	–	6 per cent, borrowed under the 49th Geo. 3.
£. 105,200	–	–	

	£.	s.	d.
Paid off by late Treasurer (Alderman Carleton) from 1810 to 1814	4,300	–	–
Paid off by present Treasurer (Alderman Archer) from 1814 to 1822	21,200	–	–
£.	25,500	–	–

W. H. Archer, City Treasurer.

Appendix, N° 19.

ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipewater and Metal Main Establishment, for seven years; commencing 29th September 1815, and ending 29th September 1822.

(N° 1.)

An ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1815, and ending 29th September 1816.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors from 29th September 1815 to 29th September 1816, for and on account of pipe water rents	10,915	15	8
D° from Commissioners for Paving, &c. for supplying fountains	150	–	–
D° from D° D° for watering D°	100	4	11½
D° Richard Crofton, being so much over paid him by John Carleton	17	19	1½
D° from Collector, from 29th September 1815 to 29th September 1816, for and on account of metal main tax	10,409	6	9
£.	21,593	6	6

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1816	5,806	–	–
D° off twenty-nine debentures per sinking fund	2,900	–	–
D° interest on d°	99	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1816	1,469	11	10½
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipt of the revenue of the north side, ending 24th June 1816	734	10	7½
D° Commissioners of Paving, &c. for paving over mains	583	19	5
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills	1,184	2	10½
D° Taaffe and Donohoe, contractors, d° d°	715	–	11½
D° Rents and taxes	2,813	17	4½
D° Salaries	2,693	11	6
D° Elinor Atkinson, 1½ years annuity	45	–	–
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills; iron pipes, lead, &c.	783	2	5½
£.	19,827	17	1

W. H. Archer, City Treasurer.

Appendix, N° 19—*continued.*

(N° 2.)

AN **ACCOUNT** of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1816, and ending 29th September 1817.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors, from 29th September 1816 to 29th September 1817, for and on account of Pipe Water Rents	9,753	6	1½
- D° - From Commissioners for paving, &c. for supplying fountains	150	–	–
- D° - From Collectors from 29th September 1816 to 29th September 1817, for and on account of metal main tax	9,176	16	8
£.	19,080	2	9½

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1817	5,185	–	–
D° off thirty-three debentures, per sinking fund	3,300	–	–
D° interest on - - - d°	108	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1817	1,430	5	7½
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipt of the revenue of the north side, ending 24th June 1817	693	18	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on £. 100. 4. 11½. received from Commissioners for paving, for supplying watering fountains	12	10	7½
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent for north side for d°	6	1	7
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills	1,079	9	2
D° Commissioners for paving, &c. for paving over mains	593	7	2
D° Taaffe and Donohoe, contractors, amount of weekly bills	691	4	9
D° Rents and Taxes	2,815	3	–
D° Salaries	2,693	11	6
D° Elinor Atkinson one year's annuity	30	–	–
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills, iron pipes, lead, &c. &c.	1,524	9	2
£.	20,163	–	7

(N° 3.)

AN **ACCOUNT** of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishments, for one year, commencing 29th September 1817, and ending 29th September 1818.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors, from 29th September 1817 to 29th September 1818, for and on account of pipe water rents	8,533	14	7½
- D° - from Collectors from 29th September 1817 to 29th September 1818, for and on account of metal main tax	7,863	9	9
£.	16,397	4	4½

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1818	5,049	–	–
D° off thirty-two debentures, per sinking fund	3,200	–	–
D° interest on - - d°	108	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1817	1,299	16	8
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipts of the revenue of the north side, ending 24th June 1817	665	19	–
D° Commissioners for paving, &c. for paving over mains	624	4	–
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills	1,007	10	7½
D° Taaffe and Donohoe	623	9	2½
D° Rent and taxes	5,304	7	7½
D° Salaries	2,693	11	6
D° Elinor Atkinson, one year's annuity	30	–	–
D° Sundry tradesmen's bills	1,350	13	10½
£.	21,956	12	6

(*continued.*)

Appendix, N° 19—*continued.*

(N° 4.)

An ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1818 and ending 29th September 1819.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors, from 29th September 1818 to 29th September 1819, for and on account of pipe water rents	8,471	3	3
- D° - - from Commissioners for Paving, &c. for supplying fountains; 2 years	300	–	–
D° - from - - - D° - - - D° - - - for watering 3 years, 5th April 1819	398	1	6
- D° - from Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, sale of old pipes	17	13	5
- D° - from Collectors, from 29th September 1818 to 29th September 1819, for and on account of metal main tax	8,488	2	6
£.	17,675	–	8

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1819	5,183	10	–
D° off two debentures and interest	206	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1819	1,221	5	7½
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipt of the revenue of the north side, ending 24th June 1819	557	6	6
D° Commissioners for Paving, &c. for paving over mains	613	18	6
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills	1,043	15	10½
D° Taaffe and Donohoe, contractors, d° - - - d°	713	5	3
D° Rents and taxes	2,795	3	10½
D° Salaries	2,343	11	6
D° Elinor Atkinson, one year's annuity	30	–	–
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills, iron pipes, lead, &c.	1,603	5	5
£.	16,311	2	6½

(N° 5.)

An ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1819, and ending 29th September 1820.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors from 29th September 1819 to 29th September 1820, for and on account of pipe water rent	11,877	4	2
- D° - from Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, sale of old pipes	13	17	8
- D° - from Collectors, from 29th September 1819 to 29th September 1820, for and on account of metal main tax	11,444	12	6
£.	23,335	14	4

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1820	5,047	–	–
D° off ten debentures	1,000	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1820	1,278	14	7
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipt of the revenue of the north side, ending 24th June 1820	692	12	9
D° Commissioners for Paving, &c.; for paving over mains	591	19	2
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper; amount of weekly bills	1,156	–	11½
D° Taaffe and Donohoe, contractors, d° - - - d°	655	16	4½
D° Rents and Taxes	2,798	4	6½
D° Salaries	3,043	11	6
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills, iron pipes, lead, &c.	2,720	8	6½
£.	18,984	8	5

Appendix, N° 19—*continued.*

(N° 6.)

AN ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1820 and ending 29th September 1821.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d.
RECEIVED from Collectors from 29th September 1820 to 29th September 1821, for and on account of pipe water rents - - - - - -	9,738	12	6
- D° - from Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, and Taaffe, contractor, sale old pipes, &c. - - - - - - - - - - - - -	21	13	6
- D° - from Commissioners for paving, &c. and for supplying fountains; 2 years	300	–	–
- D° - from - - D° - - - for watering - - - - - - -	252	14	11
- D° - from Collectors, from 29th September 1820 to 29th September 1821, for and on account of metal main tax - - - - - -	9,590	4	11
£.	19,903	5	10

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d.
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1821 - - - - - - -	4,852	10	–
D° off thirty-seven debentures - - - - - - - - - - -	3,700	–	–
D° Interest on - - d° - - - - - - - - - - - - -	61	18	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on gross receipts of rents of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1821 - - - - - - -	1,298	9	–
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross revenue of the north side, ending the 24th June 1821 - - - - - - - - -	609	16	3
D° Paving Commissioners, for paving over mains - - - - - -	907	6	2
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills - - - - -	1,188	2	2½
D° Rents and taxes - - - - - - - - - - - -	1,567	11	9
D° Taaffe and Donoghoe, contractors, amount of weekly bills - - -	796	8	5½
D° Salaries - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2,566	12	6
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills, for iron pipes, lead, &c. - - - -	3,108	–	1½
£.	20,656	14	5½

(N° 7.)

AN ACCOUNT of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Pipe Water and Metal Main Establishment, for one year, commencing 29th September 1821 and ending 29th September 1822.

RECEIPTS:	£.	s.	d
RECEIVED from Collectors from 29th September 1821 to 29th September 1822, for and on account of rents - - - - - - - -	9,733	13	11
- D° - Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, sale of old pipes - - - - -	8	7	1½
- D° - from Collectors from 29th September 1821 to 29th September 1822, for and on account of metal main tax - - - - - -	9,542	11	10
£.	19,284	12	10½

DISBURSEMENTS:	£.	s.	d
PAID Interest, one year, due 25th March 1822 - - - - - -	4,665	10	–
D° off forty-one debentures - - - - - - - - - - -	4,100	–	–
D° interest on - - d° - - - - - - - - - - - - -	123	–	–
D° Grand Canal Company, 12½ per cent on the gross rent of the pipe water revenue, ending 24th June 1822 - - -	1,299	7	1
D° - - D° - - D° - - per centage on £.252. 14. 11. received from Paving Commissioners for watering streets - -	31	11	10
D° Royal Canal Company, 15 per cent on the gross receipts of the revenue on the north side, ending 24th June 1822 - - - - - -	660	6	4½
D° Commissioners for Paving, &c. for paving over mains - - - - -	781	17	4
D° Hugh Crofton, storekeeper, amount of weekly bills - - - - -	1,184	13	5½
D° Taaffe & Donoghoe, contractors, d° - - - d° - - - - - - -	752	19	11
D° Rents and taxes - - - - - - - - - - - - -	321	11	2¾
D° Salaries - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2,654	2	6
D° Sundry tradesmen, their bills, iron pipes, lead, &c. - - - - -	2,648	18	5¾
£.	19,223	18	2½

W. H. Archer, City Treasurer.

Appendix, No. 20.

LETTER from Inspector General of Prisons in Ireland to the Chairman of the Committee, enclosing Plan for Reduction of Expenditure in the Medical Department of the Dublin Prisons.

1, Fitzwilliam-square, Dublin,
15th June 1823.

Dear Sir,

IN compliance with my promise to your Committee, I hasten to inclose our plan for the reduction of expenditure in the medical department of the Dublin prisons, which I trust will be found satisfactory. The salary for the resident surgeon may appear small, but we know a proper person can be had for it; and if advertized for, numerous applications would be made for it from numbers of the College of Surgeons of Dublin, whose talents would not for a moment be disputed. Residence, with coals, &c. would make it a desirable thing: the duty would be moderate, when compared to that of a regiment of 1,000 men, to which there is not a greater medical staff than we allow for the Dublin gaols. The resident or his assistant, should be bound to attend the sick debtors in the sheriff's prison and city marshalsea, and provide them with medicines from the hospital; and we do not hesitate to say, that if this plan is adopted, it will not only produce a considerable saving, (perhaps fully two thirds,) but secure to the prisoners in hospital that constant attendance at all hours, which the present system and legal enactments, I may say, almost precludes, however zealous the medical officers may be. At present, if a prisoner is suddenly taken ill, or an accident occurs, it is necessarily some time before the medical officers can be procured, even if at home when sent for, and then a delay is occasioned in sending for the prescription to the apothecary, all which is involved in the present system, notwithstanding the utmost energy and exertion on the part of the medical men.

I have the honour to be, dear Sir,
Your obliged and faithful servant,
James Palmer,
Insp^r Gen^l of Prisons.

T. Spring Rice, Esq. M. P.
&c. &c. &c.

P. S. If practicable, I think I should have my expenses paid as well as others; literally my visit to England was to *visit* the gaols; and our salary is but moderate when our travelling officer and clerk is deducted from it; I, however, do not press it, though you certainly would have summoned me, had you known the testimony I could give, free of all local or party prejudices.

HALF YEAR's Account of Medical Salaries and Expenses, ending Michaelmas 1822.

NAMES.	SITUATIONS.	WHERE.	HALF-YEARS.			Observations.
			£.	s.	d.	
William Harty	Physician	all Dublin prisons	200	-	-	
Alex. Read	Surgeon	D°	113	15	-	
Craven & Nicholls	Apothecaries	D°	10	-	-	
Geo. Richardson	Hospital superintendent	Newgate	21	2	6	
Thomas Connor	Surgical - - d°	D°	21	2	6	this man now discontinued.
Marg. Byrne	D° - - d°	Sheriff's prison	15	-	-	
Anne Warren	D° - - d°	City marshalsea	15	-	-	not the same person.
Anne Warren	D° - - d°	Bridewell	20	-	-	
Andrew Carthy	D° - - d°	D°	20	-	-	
Medicines	Physician	all the prisons	125	9	-	
Necessaries	D°	D°	29	8	1	
Medicines	Surgeon	D°	97	7	11	
Necessaries	D°	D°	11	15	3	
		Half-year - - £.	700	-	3	
		Per annum - - £.	1,400	-	6	
		New plan, as below, for one year	490	-	-	
		Saving	910	-	6	

IT is proposed to *abolish* the hospitals at Newgate and Smithfield Penitentiary, and to remove all the Sick to the Male and Female Hospital at Richmond Bridewell; and the following sums we conceive would nearly cover the expense.

	£.	s.	d.	
1 Resident surgeon - - - - - -	150	–	–	per annum.
1 Assistant d°, and apothecary - - -	70	–	–	d°.
1 Hospital steward - - - - - -	40	–	–	d°.
1 Assistant d° - - - - - - -	30	–	–	d°.
1 Female Superintendent - - - -	40	–	–	d°.
1 Assistant d° - - - - - - -	30	–	–	d°.
Medicines and necessaries from Apothecaries Hall, to be compounded by the assistant surgeon - - - - - - - -	100	–	–	d°.
Matron, City Marshalsea and Sheriff's Prison -	30	–	–	d°.
£.	490	–	–	d°.

N. B.—There is a cart now in the Bridewell for which a horse is hired, and a very trifling expense (if any) would be added by the purchase of a horse, who could do all the work of Bridewell and Hospital. An hospital *room* might be continued at City Marshalsea, and the Sheriff's Prison, to be attended by the above medical staff.

Sixteen rooms of prison accommodation would be gained by this plan.

James Palmer,
R. R. Woodward.

Appendix, N° 21.

A STATEMENT of the Amount paid by the Collector of Carts and Cars Rent, to the Receiver of the Police Establishment, for the Years 1820, 1821, and 1822; distinguishing the amount paid on each description yearly.

YEAR	Amount received for Town Cars.			Amount received for One-horse Carts.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1820 - -	1,870	–	–	76	17	8
1821 - -	1,925	–	–	76	17	8
1822 - -	2,000	–	–	87	5	–
£.	5,795	–	–	241	–	4

3d June 1823. *Henry Darley*, Collector.

Appendix, N° 22.

AMOUNT received for Cart and Car Licences, from the year 1815 until 1823.

YEAR	Amount received on One-horse Carts.			Amount received on Town Carts.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1816 - -	82	10	–	315	–	–
1817 - -	35	10	–	342	–	–
1818 - -	47	–	–	258	–	–
1819 - -	58	–	–	334	–	–
1820 - -	27	10	–	201	–	–
1821 - -	67	10	–	182	–	–
1822 - -	57	10	–	205	–	–
£.	375	10	–	1,837	–	–

Carriage Department,
Head Office of Police, Dublin,
3d June 1823.

J. Pemberton,
Register.

Appendix, N° 23.

CHARTER to the Corporation of the City of Dublin.

(Translation.)

JAMES the Second, by the grace of God of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, defender of the Faith, and so forth, to all to whom these presents shall come, greeting; Whereas the city of Dublin was an ancient and populous city, and the capital of our entire kingdom of Ireland, and inasmuch as the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin have had, used and enjoyed divers liberties, franchises, privileges, immunities and pre-eminences, or at least have alleged, that they have had, used and enjoyed same, and were used so to do, and that they were a body corporate and politic by the name of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin: And whereas by the judgment of our court of Exchequer of our kingdom of Ireland, the said liberties, franchises, privileges, immunities and pre-eminences were seized into our hands, We nevertheless willing that for ever hereafter, a certain and indubitable method might be had in Dublin aforesaid, of and for the keeping of our peace, and for the rule and governance of our said city of Dublin, and of our people therein residing, and of others thereto resorting; and that Dublin aforesaid may at all times hereafter be and continue a peaceable and quiet city, a dread and terror to the ill-disposed, and a reward and support to the good; and also that our peace and other acts of justice and good government may therein be better preserved and performed, Know ye that We of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, with the advice and consent of our well beloved and right trusty cousin and counsellor, Richard Earl of Tyrconnell, our deputy general and general governor of our kingdom of Ireland, and according to the tenour of our letters under our privy seal and sign manual, bearing date at our court at Windsor, the twentieth day of September, in the year of our reign, and inrolled in the rolls of our court of Chancery of our said kingdom of Ireland, have willed, ordained, constituted, confirmed and declared, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do will, ordain, constitute, confirm and declare, that the city or town of Dublin in the province of Leinster in our kingdom of Ireland, shall for ever hereafter be and be called and named the city of Dublin, and that all and singular houses, edifices, lands and tenements, waters and water courses, and the soil and bottom of the same which at any time heretofore were had or reputed to be within the city of Dublin, the suburbs, franchises, liberties or precincts of the same, shall from henceforth be within the jurisdiction and liberties of the said city, and all and singular the premises into one entire city of itself, by the name of the City of Dublin, for us, our heirs and successors, We do erect, constitute, ordain, make and create; and that the said city of Dublin and the circuit, precincts, limits, bounds, ambits, liberties, franchises and jurisdictions of the same may extend, and claim the same places, lands, limits and ambits, as well by land as by water, to which the city of Dublin, the suburbs and franchises of the same at any time heretofore have extended, or claimed to extend; and that within the said city, there shall be for ever one body corporate and politic in fact and name, by the name of the mayor, sheriffs, citizens and commons of the said city; and that the mayor and sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their succesors, may exercise and execute all the rights and jurisdictions hereafter mentioned, the circuit, precincts, limits, bounds and ambit aforesaid; and further, for us, our heirs and successors, We have willed, granted, decreed, confirmed, created and ordained, that the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and those who hereafter shall be mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, shall for ever hereafter be by virtue of these presents one new body corporate and politic, in deed, fact and name, by the name of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin; and as a new body corporate and politic, in deed, fact and name, We do really and fully for us, our heirs and successors, erect, make, ordain, constitute, create, confirm and declare them by these presents, and that by that name they may have perpetual successions; and that they and their successors for ever, by the name of the mayor, sheriffs commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, shall be at all times hereafter persons fit and capable in said, to have, acquire, receive and possess lands, tenements, goods and chattels, rents, reversions, possessions, liberties, privileges, rights, jurisdictions, franchises and hereditaments whatever, of whatsoever nature, kind or species they may be, to them and their successors in fee or perpetuity, or for term of years or year, or otherwise howsoever; and also to give, grant, demise and assign lands, tenements and other their hereditaments, goods and chattels, and to do and execute all and singular other acts and things by the name aforesaid, and that they and their successors for ever, by the name of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, can and may plead and be impleaded, answer and be answered, defend and be defended in all courts and places, and before any the judges, justices and other persons, officers, of us, our heirs and successors, in all and singular actions, plaints, pleas, causes and matters (and demands) whatsoever, of whatsoever kind, nature or species they may be, and in the same manner and form as any other our liege subjects of our said kingdom of Ireland, persons fit and capable in law or any other body corporate and politic within our said kingdom of Ireland, can and may have, acquire, receive, possess, enjoy, grant, demise, plead and be impleaded, answer and be answered, defend

defend and be defended, make, suffer or execute; and that the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and their successors for ever hereafter, shall and may have a common hall to serve for doing the affairs and business of them and their successors; and that it shall and may be lawful for the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, to alter and change the said seal from time to time at their pleasure and another to make a new as to them shall seem most meet; and further, for us, our heirs and successors, We will, ordain, constitute, confirm and declare that the said city of Dublin, the suburbs, franchises, liberties and precincts of the same, and also all and singular castles, messuages, houses, edifices, lordships, manors, towns, lands, hamlets, lands, tenements, waters, rivulets, ports, meadows, moors and other hereditaments whatsoever within the said city of Dublin, the franchises, liberties and precincts of the same, and those which heretofore at any time were reputed to be situate or lying within the city of Dublin, the suburbs, franchises, liberties and precincts of the said city of Dublin, or within the county of the said city, either by land or by water, shall for ever be united, consolidated and for ever hereafter be one entire county, distinct and separate from the county of Dublin, and from all our counties within our kingdom of Ireland, to all intents and purposes, and in as ample manner and form as any other county within our kingdom of Ireland, and for ever hereafter be, and be named, known and called the county of the city of Dublin; and all and singular the premises into one entire free and distinct county of the city of Dublin by itself, for us, our heirs and successors, We do erect, ordain, confirm and create by these presents; provided that no land or tenements shall be within the county of the city of Dublin which heretofore were not within the same: And further of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, We will, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, We do grant to the aforesaid mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and do declare and ordain, that for ever hereafter there shall be within the said city of Dublin, one of the more honest and discreet citizens or commons of the said city aforesaid (in manner hereafter in these presents mentioned) from time to time elected, who shall be and be called the mayor of the city aforesaid; and also we will for ever there shall be within the said city twenty-four of the more honest and discreet citizens or commons of the said city, or the liberties thereof, (according to the ordinances hereinafter in these presents specified,) from time to time elected, who shall be and be called all men of said city ; and that every mayor after he hath finished his mayoralty shall be an alderman of said city during his life, and that said alderman be from time to time aiding and assisting to the mayor of the city for the time being, in all causes and matters, or liberties thereof; and likewise that there be within the said city of Dublin, two of the more honest and discreet citizens or commons of the said city or the liberties thereof, in form hereinafter in these presents mentioned, from time to time elected, who shall be and be called sheriffs of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and of the county of the said city; one of the more discreet citizens or commons of the said city, from time to time likewise elected, who shall be and be named the chamberlain of the said city; and that likewise there shall for ever within the said city, forty-eight of the more honest and discreet citizens and commons of the said city or of the liberties thereof, in manner hereinafter in these presents mentioned, from time to time elected, who shall be and be named the free burgesses of the said city, which free burgesses shall from time to time be likewise aiding and assisting to the mayor and aldermen of the said city, in all affairs and matters touching or concerning the said city and the liberties thereof; and further we have ordained, constituted and made, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain, constitute, nominate, make, grant and declare that the mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, chamberlain and free burgesses of the said city for the time being, and their successors, shall be, and be called the common council of the said city of Dublin, and each of them for the time being, so long as he shall remain in his said office or place, shall be one of the common council of the said city of Dublin; and further, We will also and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do grant, decree, ordain, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do grant, decree, ordain and declare that the aldermen, free burgesses, chamberlain and recorder of the said city for the time being, and such persons as hereafter shall be hereafter freemen of the said city, be and shall be commons and citizens of the said city; and further, We will, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors for ever, that it shall and may be lawful for them the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, to have, retain and appoint a certain council house within the said city, and that the said mayor, sheriffs and the rest of the common council of the said city, and their successors, or the major part of them for the time being, as often as to them shall seem fit or necessary, can and may at all times hereafter assemble and hold within the said house, a certain court or assembly of themselves the said mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them, and in the said court or assembly, to treat of, confer, consult and determine of the statutes, articles and ordinances of the said city, and the franchises and liberties of the same, and touching the good rule, estate and government of the same according to the sound discretion of them, or the major part of them; and further, We will, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, and their successors, or the major part of them, upon public summons to be made for this purpose by the mayor of the said city for the time being, or by his precept for that purpose, may have and hereafter shall have full power, rights and authority from time to time for ever, of composing, enacting, ordaining and making laws, statutes, constitutions, decrees and ordinances whatsoever in writing, which shall be reasonable and necessary, and which shall appear to them in their sound discretion to be good, wholesome, honest, necessary and requisite, for the good rule and government of the said city, and of all and singular officers and ministers, citizens, artificers and inhabitants whatsoever, residing and adjourning in said city and liberties thereof for the time being, and for the preservation, government, disposal, levying and summoning of the lands, possessions, reversions and hereditaments, to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin aforesaid, hereinafter by these presents granted or assigned, or hereafter to be given, granted or assigned: And also for the rule and goverment of the markets and fairs within the said city of Dublin, the liberties and limits thereof, and of the people coming and resorting to the said fairs and markets, or any of them, and for their benefit and advantage, We will that the said mayor, sheriffs, citizens, and all and singular officers, artificers and inhabitants of the said city and the liberties thereof, and their factors, servants and ministers in their several offices, functions, services, arts and businesses, within the said city and the liberties thereof, for the time being, shall hold, demean and employ themselves to the advancement of the public good, common utility and good government of the said city and the liberties thereof, and the provisions of the same, and will consider of the things, causes and matters of the said city, or of the citizens or inhabitants thereof, or which or anywise touch or concern the arts, trades or mysteries in the said city and the liberties thereof, and that the mayor, and the rest of the common council of the said city, for the time being, and their successors, or the major part of them, as often as they have enacted, made, ordained and established in form aforesaid, such laws, statutes, rights, ordinances and decrees, can and may make, ordain, provide and inflict such and the like pains, punishments and penalties, by corporal imprisonments, or by fines, or amerciaments, or either of them, against and upon all persons who shall break through all such laws, rights, ordinances and decrees, or any of them, as to them, the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city for the time being, or the major part of them, shall seem most necessary, opportune, fit, reasonable and requisite for the observance of the said laws, ordinances and decrees; and that the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, from time to time can and may levy and have the said fines, amerciaments and penalties to the use and behoof of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, without the impediment of us, our heirs and successors, or of any the officers or ministers of us, our heirs or successors, without any accounts thereof to us, our heirs or successors, to be rendered thereout; all and every of which laws, ordinances and rights as aforesaid, made or to be made, We desire shall be observed under the penalties therein contained; provided nevertheless, that all and every such laws, statutes, ordinances, rights, decrees, pains, punishments penalties, imprisonments, fines and amerciaments be agreeable and not repugnant or contrary to the laws, statutes, rights or customs of our said kingdom of Ireland: And for the better execution of our will in this behalf, and that this new incorporation may be first composed of discreet and honest men, We do constitute and make our beloved Thomas Hacket, merchant, to be the first and modern mayor of the said city of Dublin, desiring that the said Thomas Hackett should be and continue in his said office of mayor of said city from the making of these presents until the feast of Saint Michael the Archangel next after the date of these presents, and from thence until another alderman of the said city be into that office in due form elected and sworn, according to the ordinances and provisions in these presents hereafter expressed and declared, if the said Thomas Hackett should so long live; and also, we have constituted, assigned, nominated and made, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do assign, nominate, constitute and make our cousin and counsellor, William Earl of Limerick, Sir Joshua Allen, knight, Sir Able Ram, knight, Sir Michael Creagh, knight, William Ellis, esquire, Enoth Redder, merchants, William Gardner, merchant, John Etherington, esquire, Mathew Barnwall, merchant, Michael Lincoln, John Rogerson, Terence Dermott, senior, James Clarke, Bartholomew Vanhamreigh, Nicholas Lincoln, James Malone, Samuel Claridge, Robert Warren, Terence Dermott, junior, Anthony Sharpe Baker, William Kennedy, Edmund Reilly, Richard Dalton and Daniel McNaughton, merchants, to be the modern twenty-four aldermen of the said city of Dublin, to continue in their said offices during their natural lives, unless in the mean time for any reasonable cause they or any of them be removed from their said offices and places, whom for such reasonable causes, We will, shall be reasonable by the mayor and the rest of the common council aforesaid, or the major part of them, or unless in the mean time they or any of them be removed by reason of any provision in these presents expressed; We have also assigned, constituted and made, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do assign, nominate, constitute and make, our beloved Thomas Kiernan, brewer, and Edmund Kelly, merchant, to be the modern sheriffs of said city, and of the county of said city, from the making of these presents until the feast Saint Michael the Archangel next following, and from thence until two other of the free burgesses or citizens and commons of the said city be elected, perfected and sworn into said offices of sheriffs of the city and county aforesaid, according to the ordinances and constitutions hereinafter in these presents expressed and declared, provided the said Thomas Kiernan and Edmund Kelly shall so long live; and also, We have constituted and made, and for us, our heirs and successors, do assign, nominate, constitute and make, our beloved William Ellis the first and present chambelain of said city, to continue in said office during his good behaviour therein; and also, We have assigned, constituted and made, and by these presents do assign, nominate and make, our beloved Michael Geraldine, Peter Shee,

Michael

Michael Andrew Rowe, John Dowde, Simon Carrick, William Furlong, merchants, John Cayne, ribbon weaver, Richard Malone, Andrew Dalton, Edward Ross, John Moore, Nicholas Barnwall, George Kennedy, Christopher Warren, Michael Hall, Walter Harris, Francis Worrald, Francis Rice, Samuel Walton, merchants, Thomas Gibbon, brazier, Robert Payne, linen draper, Anthony Piercy, merchant, John Hackett, merchant, Isaac Holdroid, merchant, Theobald Butler, woollen draper, Henry Wilson, merchant, Thomas Quinn, apothecary, Thomas Sutton, gardener, William Ambrose, wine merchant, Earol Eastwood, brewer, Richard Hart, baker, Robert Strong, baker, Arthur Emerson, brewer, Thomas Nowlan, brazier, William Quinn, carver, Richard Noyce, wine merchant, Richard Locke, gentlemen, Christopher Palles, goldsmith, Thomas Howe, merchant, Oliver Nugent, goldsmith, Timothy Sullivan, wine merchant, William Stawell, ironmonger, John Byrne, cooper, Robert Bellew, apothecary, Henry Smith, merchant, Patrick Archbold, surgeon, and Edward Lloyd, merchant, to be the modern free burgesses of the said city, to continue in their said offices of burgesses of said city during their respective natural lives, unless in the mean time by reason of any provision in these presents expressed, or for any reasonable cause they or any of them be removed from that office, all whom We desire shall be amoveable for such reasonable cause, by the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part thereof: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do assign and nominate as the modern common council of the said city, the said modern mayor, modern aldermen, modern chamberlain, modern sheriffs and modern burgesses in these presents named, provided that each of the common council of the said city in these presents named, and who hereafter shall be themselves of the common council of the said city, shall take his corporal oath, well and faithfully to execute his office or place of common councilman of the said city, before the mayor of said city for the time being, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give power to administer said oath: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for the time being, or the major part of them, from time to time for ever, the date of these presents shall and may have power and authority, yearly and every year on every second Friday after the feast of Easter, in our said city of Dublin, elect and nominate such person there and at the time of such their election to be mayor of said city, or to elect one of the aldermen of said city to be mayor thereof for one entire year after, in manner hereinafter by these presents limited; and that every person as aforesaid, elected and nominated mayor of the said city of Dublin, shall at the feast of Saint Michael the Archangel next after such nomination and election, come before the chief governor or governors of our united kingdom of Ireland for the time being, or before the chief baron of our kingdom of Ireland or in their absence, before the last preceding mayor his predecessor, and take as well the corporal oath following, *viz.* "I do hereby acknowledge, profess, " testify and declare, in my conscience before God and the world, that our sove- " reign Lord King James is lawful and rightful king of this his realm, and other his " Majesty's dominions and countries, and I will bear faith and true allegiance to his " Majesty, his heirs and successors, and him and them will defend to the utmost of my " power, against all conspirators and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his " or their crown and dignity, and do my best endeavours to disclose and make known " unto his Majesty, his heirs and successors, or to the lord deputy or other chief go- " vernor and governors of this kingdom for the time being, all treasons and traitorous " conspiracies which I shall know or hear, to be intended against his Majesty, his heirs " and successors, or any of them; and I do now make this recognizance and acknow- " ledgement, heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a christian.—So help me God. " And I do also declare and believe, that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, " to take arms against the King, and that I do abhor that traitorous position, of taking " arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him. " So help me God," &c. as also his corporal oath of well, truly and faithfully executing the said office of mayor of the aforesaid city of Dublin, in and by all things concerning said office; to which chief governor or governors for the time being, and chief baron for the time being, and such last preceding mayor, by these presents We do give and grant power and authority to give and administer said oaths; and that after such oaths are so made, he can and may execute the office of mayor of the said city for one entire year, from thence next following, and from thence until another alderman of said city for the time being, be in due form elected and sworn into said office of mayor of said city, according to the ordinances in these expressed and declared: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that if it shall happen that the mayor of the said city of Dublin shall within the year after he be elected and sworn into the office of mayor of said city, die or be removed from his office, either by death or by reason of any other vacancy of said office of mayor of said city, for the time being, that then and so often, it shall and may be lawful for the said aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, to assemble themselves or the major part of them, within ten days next after such death, removal, decease or vacancy, in their common hall or any other covenant place within the said city of Dublin, and there elect and nominate another good and fit man out of the aldermen of said city, as and for mayor of said city of Dublin, in the place of him so deceased or removed from his office; and that every person so as aforesaid nominated and elected mayor of said city, before he can exercise said

said office, shall take the aforesaid several corporal oaths before the chief governor or governors of our kingdom, of our court of Exchequer of our said kingdom, for the time being, to whom respectively, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give power and authority to administer said oaths; and that after said oaths is so made, he can and may execute said office of mayor of said city, in the place of such mayor so deceased or amoved from his office, for the remainder of that year, and from thence until another alderman of the said city for the time being, be in due form elected, perfected and sworn into the office of mayor of the said city, according to the ordinances and constitutions in these presents declared: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, for the time being, or the major part of them, from time to time for ever, shall ever after the date of these presents, have full power and authority yearly and every year, on the second Friday after Easter to elect and nominate two of the more honest and discreet burgesses, citizens or commons of said city, to be sheriffs of the said city, to be sheriffs of the said city and county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, for one entire year, next after the feast of Saint Michael thence next following, and that the persons so as aforesaid elected and nominated to be sheriffs of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and the county of the said city of Dublin, and each of them shall take, as well his corporal oath, well and faithfully to execute said office, in and by all things belonging to that office, as also the other corporal oath hereinbefore mentioned and expressed, at the feast of Saint Michael the Archangel, next after such his nomination and election, before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, to which mayor of the city of Dublin aforesaid, for the time being, We do give and grant power and authority by these presents to administer said oath; and that the persons so elected, after said oath is so made, can and may execute the office of sheriff of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and of the county of the said city of Dublin, for one entire year, in manner and form aforesaid, and from thence until the other burgesses, citizens or commons of the said city of Dublin be in form elected, perfected and sworn into the said offices of sheriffs, according to the ordinances in these presents declared; We also will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that if it shall at any time happen, that the sheriffs of the said city, and county of the city of Dublin, or either of them, shall within the year after their being sworn into the said office of sheriffs, die, or in any manner vacate their offices by reason of any provision in these presents expressed, or be removed from their offices for any reasonable cause, which sheriffs and each of them, for misconduct in that office, We will, shall be amoveable at the pleasure of the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, for the time being, or the major part of them; that then and so often it shall and may be lawful for the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, or the major part of them, within the space of ten days next after such death, decease, vacancy or removal, to assemble themselves, or the major part of them in the said city of Dublin, and their elect one or two of the burgesses, citizens or commons of the said city, to be sheriffs of the said city and county of the said city of Dublin, in the place or places of him or them so deceased or removed from that office; and that he or they so nominated and elected sheriff or sheriffs of the said city and county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, before they execute their said offices, shall take the several corporal oaths aforesaid, before the mayor of the said city, to which mayor for the time being, We do give power and authority to give and administer the same; and that after they have taken such oath, he or they can and may execute the office of sheriff or sheriffs of the said city and county of the city of Dublin, in the place or places of him or them so deceased or removed from that office, for the remainder of that year, and until one or two other burgesses, citizens or commons of the said city, into said office of sheriffs of the said city and county of the said city of Dublin, be in due form elected, perfected and sworn, according to the ordinances in these presents expressed and declared, and so as often as the case shall so happen; and that the sheriffs for the time being, after they have fulfilled their said offices, shall be burgesses of the said city during their natural lives, unless by reason of any clause in these presents they be removed from their said offices: And further, We will, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the said aldermen and free burgesses in these presents named and elected, and these hereafter to be named and elected, and each of them shall take respectively, their corporal oaths in all things well and faithfully to execute their said offices, and also the other corporal oath to be made and taken by the mayor of the said city of Dublin, for the time being, before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, and that after such oath so made, they and each of them may hold and exercise such office or offices of alderman and burgesses of said city, during the natural life and lives of them and each of them; to which mayor, for the time being, by these presents, we do give and grant power to give and administer said oath; and if it shall happen that any of the aldermen of the said city of Dublin shall die or vacate his office, by reason of any provision in these presents expressed, or be deprived of his said office for any reasonable cause, which aldermen and every of them for misconduct in their said offices We will, shall be amoveable at the pleasure of the mayor and aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them, for the time being, then We will and grant, that the mayor and aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them can and may, in our said city of Dublin, within ten days after

after the death, decease, vacancy or removal of such alderman or aldermen, from time to time for ever elect and make one, or as many as may be wanting, of the said number of twenty-four aldermen, out of the free burgesses of the said city of Dublin, in the place or places of such alderman or aldermen so dead or amoved, to continue in their offices during their natural lives, if they should so long well behave themselves in their said offices; and that they, or those who hereafter may be nominated or elected aldermen in the said city, shall take their corporal oaths before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, well and faithfully to execute the said office in all things concerning the same, and the other oaths aforesaid, and may hold and exercise the said office during their respective natural lives, if so long they and each of them respectively shall continue and well conduct himself or themselves in said office, to which mayor for the time being, We do by these presents give and grant by these presents, power and authority to give and administer said oaths; We will also, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin and their successors, that if any person who shall be as aforesaid elected to the office of mayor or alderman within the said city of Dublin, shall refuse to undertake the burthen and execution of the said office, and perform the duty for which he is so elected and perfected, that then and so often as such person so elected and perfected shall so refuse, the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, or the major part of them, shall from time to time, and at all times hereafter, have full power and authority of assessing, taxing and imposing any reasonable fine, penalty or sum of money on such person so elected and perfected, and to be elected and perfected, and who shall in such manner refuse to undertake the said office of mayor or alderman of the said city of Dublin, and the burthen and execution of the same respectively, provided that such fine, penalty or sum of money shall not exceed the sum of 200*l.* legal money of England; and if and as often as any such person (on whom any such fine, penalty or sum of money, in the manner and for the reason aforesaid, shall be imposed, taxed or assessed) shall not pay the said fine, penalty or sum of money, or deny or refuse paying the same at such time or times as the said common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, or the major part of them shall decree or appoint, that then and so often the said mayor, sheriffs and commons, and citizens of the said city of Dublin for the time being, and their successors from time to time, shall and may have, by means of these presents, full power and authority to levy, collect and recover every such fine, penalty or sum of money, by distringas or action of debt, or on the case, in any court of us, our heirs or successors, in the name of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, against any such person not paying or refusing to pay such fine, penalty or sum of money upon him in manner aforesaid imposed, or to be imposed, his executors and administrators respectively, or by any other usual and lawful ways or means whatsoever, and the same to the use and behoof of them, the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city for the time being, and their successors, to detain and dispose: We will also, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that if any person who shall, in manner aforesaid, be elected and perfected into the office of sheriff of the said city and county of the said city of Dublin, shall deny or refuse to undertake the burthen and execution of the said office, and to exercise the said office of sheriff of the said city and county of the said city of Dublin aforesaid, to which he shall be so elected and perfected as aforesaid, that then and so often as the case shall so happen, the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for the time being, or the major part of them, shall and may from time to time, and at all times hereafter, have full power and authority of taxing and imposing any reasonable fine, pain, penalty or sum of money on such person to be so perfected and elected sheriff of the city and county of the said city of Dublin, and who shall so deny and refuse to undertake the said office of sheriff, and the burthen and execution thereof, provided said fine, pain, penalty and sum of money, does not exceed the sum of 200 marks of lawful money of England; and if and whensoever any such person so elected, or chosen, or to be elected or chosen sheriff of the said city and county of the said city of Dublin, and so refusing or denying as aforesaid, to undertake and exercise the said office and the execution thereof, or shall refuse to pay, satisfy, or shall oppose the said fine, pain, penalty or sum of money so upon him imposed, assessed, or to be imposed, taxed or assessed at such time or times as the said mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, or the major part of them have decreed and appointed, that then and so often the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for the time being, shall and may from time to time have full power and authority, by virtue of these presents, to levy, collect, recover, retain and dispose of every such fine, pain, penalty or sum of money, by distringas, action of debt or upon the case, in any court of us, our heirs or successors, in the manner and to the uses aforesaid; all which fines, pains, penalties and sums of money to be as aforesaid imposed, taxed or assessed for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, by these presents; and that it shall and may be lawful for the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, to receive, have, and to their proper use and behoof, retain all such fines, pains, penalties and sums of money, without any molestation, hindrance or aggrievance of us, our heirs or successors thereout to be rendered, made or done; and further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that if any

any of the free burgesses in these presents named, or any of the free burgesses of the said city of Dublin hereafter to be elected, shall die, or be removed from their said offices (which free burgesses and every of them respectively for misconduct, We will, shall be removable at the will of the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common councilmen of the said city, the major part of them for that the time being,) that then the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common councilmen of the said city of Dublin, being assembled in any convenient place within the said city, and may accordingly to the sound discretion of them or the major part of them so assembled, elect or choose one or as many as shall be wanting of the said number of forty-eight free burgesses, out of the better more discreet citizens or commons of the said city, in the place or places of such free burgess or burgesses so dead, or whose office shall be vacant, or may be removed from the same from time, as often as the case shall so happen, and that he or they so elected and chosen may have and exercise that office to which they shall be so elected and chosen, during his and their natural lives, if so long they shall well conduct themselves in that office; first taking respectively the corporal oath well and faithfully to execute said office, and the other corporal oath aforesaid, before the mayor of our said city of Dublin, and so as often as the case shall so happen, to which mayor, by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant power and authority to give and administer said oaths; and if it shall happen that the chamberlain of the said city of Dublin shall die, or vacate his said office, or be removed from the same, (which chamberlain for misconduct in that said office, We will, shall be removable at the will of the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city for the time being, or the major part of them,) then, We will and grant, that the mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, or the major part of them, being for this purpose likewise assembled in our said city of Dublin, can and may elect and choose another of the aldermen, free burgesses, citizens or commons of the said city, in the place of such chamberlain so happening to die or be removed, from time to time, as often as the case shall so happen, and the person so elected and sworn shall have and exercise that office during the pleasure of the common council of the city, for taking the corporal oath well and faithfully to execute said office, and the other corporal oath aforesaid, before the mayor of the said city, and so often as the case shall so happen, to which mayor for the time being, for us, our heirs and successors, We do by these presents, give and grant power and authority to give and administer said oaths: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that they and their successors for ever may have in the said city of Dublin, one honest and discreet man, well learned in the laws, as well of our kingdom of England as of our kingdom of Ireland, to be appointed and nominated in manner hereinafter expressed, who shall be and be called the recorder of said city; and we have appointed, constituted, nominated and made, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do appoint, nominate, constitute and make our beloved John Barnewall, esquire, to be the present recorder of the said city of Dublin, who, before he shall proceed to execute said office, shall take his corporal oath well and faithfully to execute said office of recorder of said city, in and by all things concerning the same, and the other corporal oath aforesaid, on the Holy Evangelists, before the mayor of the said city of Dublin, and after such oaths and so made, he, the said John Barnewall, shall be and continue recorder of the said city for and during his natural life, unless he shall vacate his office by reason of any provision in these presents declared, and unless in the mean time for misconduct or any other unreasonable cause he be removed therefrom by the mayor and aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city for the time being, or the major part of them, to which mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, for the time being, and the major part of them, in such case and cases and for the said cause, We do give and grant by these presents, full power and authority totally to remove and expel from the office of recorder of that city, as well the said John Barnewall as any other recorder of the said city for the time being, hereafter to be nominated or appointed by virtue of these presents, or according to the tenor thereof: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that whensoever, and as often as the place or office of recorder of the said city of Dublin shall become vacant by death, removal or otherwise howsoever, that then and so often it shall and may be lawful for the said mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, or the major part of them, to direct, elect another discreet man, learned in the law of England and Ireland, to be recorder of said city; which learned man so elected, and from time to time to be elected to that office, in form aforesaid, take the said several oaths, to be taken by the said John Barnewall, upon the Holy Evangelists of God, before the mayor of the said city for the time being, and that after the said oaths are so taken, every such learned man so elected and chosen, or to be elected or chosen to that office, shall be recorder of said city, and continue such for and during his natural life respectively, unless in the mean time for misconduct in that office, or any other reasonable cause, he be removed therefrom, or the said office in any other manner become vacant: And further, we do, by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant to the said mayor of the said city, for the time being, full power and authority to give and administer such oaths, as well to the said John Barnewall as to all and every recorder of said city for the time being, now and hereafter in manner aforesaid, respectively nominated and elected from time to time: And further, We will and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens

citizens of the said city of Dublin and their successors, that it shall and may be lawful for the said mayor of the said city of Dublin, for the time being, from time to time, to make and appoint, as often as shall be convenient for him, one of the aldermen of the said city, for the time being, to be deputy mayor of the said city, and to do and execute all and every thing which to the said office of mayor of this said city doth or ought to belong, and to continue in the said office during the sickness or absence of the said mayor of the said city, for the time being; and also that it shall and may be lawful for the recorder of the said city for the time being, to make and appoint from time to time, as often to him shall seem meet, one honest and discreet man, skilled in the laws of England and Ireland, and who shall be a barrister, to be deputy of the said recorder of said city, to do and execute all and every thing which to the office of deputy recorder of the said city, doth or ought to belong, to continue in the said office during the pleasure of the recorder of the said city for the time being; provided always, and We do by these presents strictly command, that the said deputy mayor and deputy recorder, so hereafter to be deputed and appointed, before they or either of them be permitted to execute their respective offices, shall take the several corporal oaths for the due execution of their duties respectively, and the several other corporal oaths aforesaid, before the mayor of said city of Dublin, for the time being, to which mayor for the time being, We do, for us, our heirs and successors, by these presents, give and grant full power and authority to give and administer said oaths: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of said city of Dublin, and their successors, that they and their successors for ever hereafter, can and may have within the said city, one sword bearer, who shall be called the sword bearer of the said city, shall be nominated, elected and appointed by the mayor aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, and their successors, for the time being, or the major part of them, and shall, from time to time, attend upon the said mayor of the said city, for the time being, and shall continue in that office during his good behaviour, and be amoveable for misconduct by the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them, which officer, called sword bearer, can and may bear and carry before the mayor of the said city, a sword sheathed and gilt with gold, and wheresoever within the said city, the limits, liberties and precincts of the same: And also, by these presents, We do assign, nominate and make Thomas Mullan, gentleman, the present sword bearer, during his good conduct, who, and every other sword bearer in said city, before he can exercise his office, shall take the aforesaid corporal oath of fealty, and the oath of well and truly executing said office, before the mayor of the said city of Dublin, to which mayor We do give power to administer said oaths: And that the mayor of the said city and his successors mayors of the same, for the time being, may bear before him or them successively, the cap of maintenance, in the same manner as the mayor of our city of London doth; and that the mayor of the said city of Dublin, for the time, can and may wear a collar of S. S. and that the said mayor of the said city, for the time being, shall be and be called and reputed, during his mayoralty, lord mayor, and his wife, during his mayoralty, lady mayoress; and further, have granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, with the advice and consent aforesaid, We do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that they and their successors can and may have and hold a court of record, in any convenient place within the said city of Dublin, to be held before the mayor and sheriffs of the county of the said city, and their successors, for the time being, from week to week, on every Monday and Thursday throughout the year, and that in said court they can and may hold, and by complaint being made in the same, dispose of all and all manner of actions, real, personal and mixed, and other actions, surety and demands whatsoever, as well real as personal, and mixed, of whatsoever nature, kind or species they may be, howsoever arising or happening, within the said city, and the liberties and precincts thereof, or to arise, grow, or be levied, affirmed, done, prosecuted, heard, determined and duly demanded for execution, to all intents and purposes, and in as ample manner, and as fully, freely and entirely, and by the same process as in any court of record heretofore, before any mayor and sheriffs of the said city of Dublin were used: And further, We do grant, confirm and give licence to these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, to the said mayor, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor and sheriffs of the city of Dublin for the time being, and their successors, may in our said court, to be held before the said mayor and sheriffs, have power to correct and punish all and singular, the officers, clerks and ministers of the said court, and also all other persons whomsoever offending against our said court, for their default, contempt and negligence, or other offence, howsoever perpetrated, in our said court, by reasonable fine or imprisonment, or by any other lawful ways and means whatsoever; and if any man impanelled and summoned on a jury to try an issue, do not appear before the mayor and sheriffs of the said city of Dublin, that then the man so impanelled and summoned making default, shall forfeit the issue upon all things returned, or to be returned to them, in such and the like manner as man impanelled and summoned in our said city of Dublin, for the like issue, in the court of record of the said city, have at any time heretofore forfeited and ought to forfeit; and also, that such issues forfeited and to be forfeited, shall be levied by the ministers of the said city of Dublin, to the use of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors: And further, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, for us, our heirs and successors, we do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and also ordain and appoint that there shall be, at all times hereafter

hereafter, within said city, a clerk and prothonotary of said court, to write, do, enter and enrol, all and singular pleas, complaints, writs, returns of writs, captions, bails, bills, pleadings, answers, pleas, replications, rejoinders, issues, warrants of attorney, verdicts, judgments, and copies of the same, and other records, processes and businesses of said court, and the writs, rolls and records of the same; and thereout the said clerk shall, at all times hereafter, have and receive for his labour, industry and attendance in the exercise and execution of the premises, all and singular such fees, rewards and profits as such clerk or officer in our city of Dublin hath, at any time heretofore, for or in respect of such business, office or service taken or received, and not otherwise: And also, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, for us, our heirs and successors, We do order and direct, that there shall be for ever, hereafter, a town clerk for the said city and clerk of the crown and peace for the city and county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and a clerk of the staple of said city, and that the said prothonotary, town clerk, clerk of the crown and peace and clerk of the staple for the time being, can and may exercise said offices, in as ample manner and form, and have and procure such, so many of the same and the like privileges, rights, pre-eminences, wages, rewards, fees, profits, emoluments and advantages as any prothonotary, town clerk, clerk of the crown and peace, and clerk of the peace in our said city of Dublin have at any time heretofore exercised, and for or in respect, or by reason of said offices, have or might have had, received, enjoyed or exercised: And further, of us, our heirs and successors, We do order and direct, that the prothonotary and town clerk of the said city of Dublin for the time being, shall be now and at all times clerk of the peace and crown of us, in our said city and county of the city of Dublin, and shall have and perceive the same, so many, and such and the like fees, regards, profits and advantages as any other clerk of the peace and crown of us, in any county in our said kingdom of Ireland, and be also clerk of the staple, and have the same wages, fees, regards and emoluments which any clerk of the staple hath or ought to have heretofore received and enjoyed, which office of clerk and prothonotary of said court, together with the fees, wages, profits and emoluments above thereout appointed, We do annex, conjoin and unite to the said office of the town clerk of the said city of Dublin, to continue for ever, so that said office of clerk and prothonotary of the said court, from the said office of town clerk of the said city of Dublin, shall in no wise be divided or separated: And of our more abundant special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by these presents, We do nominate, appoint, ordain and constitute, for us, our heirs and successors, John Kearney, gentleman, to be the modern clerk and prothonotary of the said court, and the modern town clerk for the said city of Dublin, and also the modern clerk of the peace and crown of us, our heirs and successors in our said city and county of Dublin, and clerk of the staple of the said city, to have, occupy and exercise the offices or employments aforesaid, to the said John Kearney, by himself or his sufficient deputy or deputies, and to have, perceive and receive out of and for the offices or occupations, to be as aforesaid exercised, the several fees, wages; regards, emoluments, profits and advantages in these presents above mentioned and appointed, for and during his natural life, unless in the mean time for misconduct in said offices or occupations, or in any of them, or for any other reasonable cause, he be removed therefrom by the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, or the major part of them, to which mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city for the time being, or the major part of them, in such and the like case and cases, We do give and grant, by these presents, full power and authority entirely to expel and remove from their said offices or employments, as well the said John Kearney as any other clerk or prothonotary of the said court, of town clerk for the said city and clerk of the peace and crown of us, our heirs and successors, in the said city and county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and clerk of the staple, for the time being, who shall be, according to the tenor of these presents nominated and appointed: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, or the major part of them, from time to time, whensoever and as often as the said office or place of clerk and prothonotary of the said court of record, and of town clerk for the said city, and of clerk of the peace and crown of us, our heirs and successors, and of clerk of the staple aforesaid, shall become void by the death or due removal of the said John Kearney, or of any other such officer, or in whatsoever other manner same may become vacant, that then and so often they shall assign, nominate, constitute and elect another good and discreet man to be clerk and prothonotary of said court of record, and town clerk for the said city, and clerk of the peace and crown of us, our heirs and successors, and clerk of the staple aforesaid in the said city and county of the city of Dublin, and to continue in said offices or occupations, and to hold and exercise the same by himself, or his sufficient deputy or deputies, and to have, receive and perceive the said fees, wages, regards, emoluments, profits and advantages, for and during the natural life of all and every such fit person so into such offices or occupations nominated or appointed, or from time to time to be nominated or appointed respectively, unless in the mean time they or any of them be, as aforesaid, in due form removed: And we will, that as well the said John Kearney as all and every other person or persons nominated and appointed, or hereafter to be nominated and appointed to the offices or places aforesaid, in manner aforesaid, and every of their deputies for the time being, shall take as well their corporal oaths on the Holy Evangelists well and truly to execute said offices or employments in all things, according to the due form of the said offices or employments, as the other corporal oaths aforesaid, before the mayor,

mayor of the said city for the time being, before they or any of them respectively be permitted to exercise said offices or employments, to which mayor of the said city for the time being, We do give and grant, by these presents, full power and authority to give and administer said several oaths, as well to the said John Kearney as to all and every person and persons in or to the said offices or employments, in form aforesaid, named and appointed, or to be hereafter named or appointed, or to any of their deputy or deputies for the time being; provided always, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and reserve to our said deputy general and chief governor or governors of us, our heirs and successors of our kingdom of Ireland, for the time being, power from time to time of approving of every recorder, town clerk or prothonotary hereafter to be elected within our said city, and that no recorder, town clerk or prothonotary to be elected within said city, or any of them, shall exercise their offices respectively, until such recorder, town clerk and prothonotary shall be approved of by the chief governor or governors of us, our heirs and successors of our said kingdom of Ireland for the time being, by writing under his hand: We also will, ordain and declare, for us, our heirs and successors, that the said modern mayor, and the mayor of the city of Dublin for the time being, shall be clerk of the market of the said city of Dublin, to exercise said office by himself, or his sufficient deputy or deputies, provided such deputy or deputies take his or their corporal oaths respectively, well and faithfully to execute said office, to which mayor for the time being, We do, by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, give power to administer said oaths; and that the mayor of the said city, for the time being, shall have the assize of bread within said city: And further, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain and appoint, that for ever hereafter there shall be in and through the said city of Dublin, and the liberties thereof, a sea port, and a port for the departure and arrival of ships, boats and other vessels, and for the loading and unloading of wares and merchandize, with all the privileges to such port belonging, which port shall be called and named the Port of Dublin: And further, We will by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, to the use and behoof, all goods and chattels of felons, felons de se, goods of fugitives, waifes and strays, and wrecks of the sea, happening or hereafter to happen, or being within the said city of Dublin, the liberties and franchises thereof: And further, of our more abundant special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, We will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and succesors, do grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin and their successors, and also by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain, establish and declare, that there thall be at all times hereafter, in our said city and county of the city of Dublin, two burgesses of the Parliament, of us, our heirs and successors, to be held for our said kingdom: And further, by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do ordain, establish and declare, that the mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin, or the major part of them for the time being, and their successors, shall and may, by virtue of a precept, mandate or process, upon a writ of us, our heirs and successors, for the election of burgesses of Parliament in that behalf duly directed, have power and authority to elect and nominate two discreet men of the said city for the time being, to be burgesses of Parliament of us, our heirs and successors, for our said county of the city of Dublin; and the said burgesses so elected at the costs and charges of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for the time being, to send to the Parliament of us, our heirs and successors, wheresoever it may be then held, in the same manner and form as in other places, cities and boroughs of our said kingdom of Ireland, or was usual and customary; which burgesses so elected and named, we will, shall be present and await and attend in any Parliament of us, our heirs and successors, of the charge and expense of the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city for the time being, during the time such Parliament may be held; and that the burgesses so elected, may in every Parliament of us, our heirs or successors, have, as well affirmative as negative, votes, and do and execute all and every other thing there, as any other burgesses of Parliament of us, our heirs and successors, can or may have, do and execute: And further, We have given, granted and confirmed, ordained and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant, confirm, ordain and declare, and also direct, and strictly for us, our heirs and successors, command all the sheriffs, officers and ministers of us, our heirs and successors, whomsoever of the said city or county of the city of Dublin for the time being, to whom any writ of us, our heirs and successors for the burgesses of Parliament, within our said city and county of our said city of Dublin, shall at any time hereafter be directed, that every such sheriff, officer and minister to whom any such writ or writs as aforesaid shall hereafter be directed, shall make his precept to the mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city of Dublin for the time being, for the election and return of such two burgesses, according to the form and effect of said writ or writs, and that these our letters patent shall be, as well to the said sheriffs and other officers of the city and county of the city of Dublin, as to the common council of the said, a sufficient warrant and discharge in this behalf: And further, for the better rule and government of the commons, citizens and inhabitants within our said city, the suburbs and franchises thereof, and of other persons resorting to the same, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, We have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that the modern mayor of the said city and every succeeding mayor of the said city, and six aldermen of the said city for the time being, and also the recorder of the said city for the time being, for and during the several and respective times they and each of them shall respectively remain or continue in the several places of mayor, aldermen and recorder of the said city, shall be, in fact and name, justices of us, our heirs and successors, to inquire (as often as to them shall seem fit and necessary) of all and singular felonies, transgressions, conspiracies, rebellions, misprisions, contempts, forfeitures, disturbances, concealments, and other crimes and offences whatsoever within our said city and the suburbs and franchises thereof, as well against the peace and common law of our said kingdom of Ireland, as against any statute, acts or ordinances in anywise had, ordained, provided or established, or hereafter to be had, ordained, provided or established, by whomsoever and howsoever done, perpetrated, inferred or attempted, or which hereafter may be done, perpetrated, attempted or inferred, and to hear and determine all and singular the premises and every of them, arising or happening, or to arise or happen within the said city and the suburbs and franchises thereof; and also, that the said mayor, six aldermen and the recorder of the said city for the time being, or any four or more of them (of whom the said mayor or recorder for the time being We will shall be one) can and may for ever hereafter, hear, determine and execute all and every such things arising and happening to arise or happen within the said city, the suburbs and franchises of the same, which any other justices of the peace of us, our heirs and successors, within our said kingdom of Ireland, in anywise appointed or to be appointed, to hear and determine according to the laws and statutes of our said kingdom, may hear, determine and execute, without any other justice of us, our heirs or successors, in any wise interfering in any of the premises within the said city and the suburbs and franchises thereof, arising or happening, or to arise or happen; We have also granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors for ever, that the said mayor, six aldermen and recorder of the said city for the time being, or any four or more of them, or whom the said mayor or recorder for the time being We will shall be one, shall from time to time and at all times hereafter, be in fact and name justices of gaol delivery of us, our heirs and successors, within said city, the suburbs and franchises thereof, of all prisoners whomsoever being therein, for all and singular felonies, crimes and other the premises whereupon said prisoners or any of them, may be indicted, corrected, attainted, called or convicted, and of all and singular other prisoners in said gaol for suspicion of felony, or for whatsoever other thing, cause or matter they may be detained or taken, as often and wheresoever as taken in the said mayor, aldermen or recorder, or any four or more of them for the time being, of whom the mayor or recorder aforesaid we will shall be one, shall seem fit or necessary, without any other justice of the peace of us or our heirs, for delivery of such gaol and prisoners hereafter by us, our heirs and successors, being appointed, unless by default of the said mayor, aldermen and recorder for the time being, or such four or more of them, according to the true intent of these presents: And moreover, that our royal purpose in the premises may have greater effect, We have nominated, appointed, ordained and constituted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do nominate, appoint, ordain and constitute our beloved Thomas Hackett, now mayor of our city, and John Barnwall, esquire, recorder of the same, William Earl of Limerick, Sir Joshua Allen, knight, Sir Michael Creagh, knight, Enoch Reader, merchant, William Gardiner and John Atherington aforesaid, now aldermen of said city, and each of them to be the first and modern justice and justices of us, our heirs and successors, for keeping the peace within said city and the suburbs, franchises and county of the said city, and for the said gaol delivery as aforesaid, according to the true intent of these presents, giving, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, granting to the said Thomas Hackett, now mayor of the said city, John Barnwall, recorder thereof, and the said William Earl of Limerick, Sir Joshua Allen, knight, Sir Michael Creagh, knight, Enoch Reader, William Gardiner and John Atherington, now aldermen of the said city, and also to the mayor, recorder and six aldermen of said city, who shall hereafter be, according to the tenor and intent of these presents, justices of the peace and gaol delivery there, and every four or more of them of whom the said mayor or recorder for the time being, We will, shall be one, full power and authority to do and execute all and every thing which to the offices of the justices of the peace and gaol delivery within the said city, suburbs and franchises and county of the said city, do by the laws and statutes of our said kingdom of Ireland belong or appertain: We will, further, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city and their successors for ever, that the said justices of the peace of the said city and county of the city of Dublin for the time being, and each of them, from time to time, may do and execute all and every other thing within the said city, the suburbs, franchises and county of the said city of Dublin, and in such the like and as ample manner and form as any other justice or justices of the peace within our said kingdom of Ireland can and may do, execute by the laws and statutes of the said kingdom, all (except the mayor aforesaid) to continue in their aforesaid offices during their respective natural lives, unless by reason of any provision by these presents, or for misconduct, or any other reasonable cause, they or any of them be removed from their said offices, whom for such cause, We will, shall be amoveable by the mayor and the rest of the common council of said city: We will, also, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city and their successors, that if it shall happen that any of the said six aldermen for the time being, constituted and nominated as aforesaid justices of the peace and gaol delivery, shall die, or be for any reasonable cause legally removed from his or their place or places respectively, that then and so often, it shall and may be lawful for the mayor and the rest of the common council ot the said city for the time being, or the major part of them from time to time for ever, to elect and choose one or more of such aldermen of the said city in the place or places of such justice or justices so dead or removed: Provided nevertheless, that as well the recorder and aldermen, justices of the peace and gaol delivery above in these presents appointed and named, and each of them, as all and every other alderman and recorder for the time being, and to be from time to time hereafter elected and chosen justices of the peace and gaol delivery of each of them, before they or any of them be permitted to execute said offices of justices of the peace and gaol delivery, shall take their corporal oaths well and faithfully to execute the office of justice of the peace and gaol delivery within said city, the suburbs and franchises of the same, and the county of the said city, before the mayor of the said city for the time being, to which mayor for the time being, We do, for us, our heirs and successors, give power to administer said oath; and that the mayor for the time being, should take the said oath before our chief governor or governors of our said kingdom for the time being, or before the chief baron of our said exchequer of our kingdom of Ireland for the time being, or before the preceding mayor or any of our justices of the peace in the said county of the city of Dublin, to whom respectively we give power to administer said oath: And further, of our special grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin and their successors, that the mayor, aldermen, and rest of the common council of the said city for the time being, or the major part of them from time to time for ever hereafter, shall have the management, rule and government of the house of correction in the said city, the suburbs and franchises thereof, and of the county of the said city for the time being, and of all delinquents or persons whomsoever, from time to time confined, committed or to be committed to the said house, according to the laws and statutes of our said kingdom of Ireland; and that the said mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them for the time being, can and may from time to time, as often as to them shall seem necessary, nominate, elect, appoint and constitute a discreet and fit man to the office or place of master or governor, which master or governor shall have (under the said mayor, aldermen and rest of the common council) the keeping, ruling and government of all and singular delinquents or other persons whomsoever, from time to time committed or to be committed to the said house of correction, to have, hold and enjoy the said office of master or governor of said house as aforesaid, during the pleasure of the said mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them for the time being; and for us, our heirs and successors, we do nominate and appoint Garrett Farrell to be the modern master of the house of correction of the city and county of the city of Dublin; and that every master for the time being, shall take the oath of well and faithfully executing the office of master of the house of correction and the other oath aforesaid, before the mayor of the said city for the time being, to whom we give power to administer said oaths; and further, We ordain, that the modern mayor, before he shall exercise his office of mayor, shall come before chief governor of our kingdom of Ireland, or before our chief baron of our kingdom of Ireland for the time being, and take his corporal oath of well and faithfully executing that office in and by all things to that office appertaining and the other aforesaid oaths, to whom respectively We give power to administer said oaths; and that the said modern sheriffs and each of them, before they shall exercise their said offices, shall respectively take their corporal oaths well and faithfully to execute said offices in and by all things concerning the same, and the other oaths aforesaid, before the mayor of said city, to whom by these presents, We give power to administer said oaths: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We will and ordain, that the mayor for the time being, shall hereafter have the assize of bread, and the service and assize of weights and measures within the said city and the franchises thereof; and further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, that the serjeants at mace and other inferior officers and ministers of said city, shall be therein hereafter elected in the same manner and by the same persons as they were at any time heretofore elected or continued; provided such officers and every of them, do take the oath of well and truly executing their offices respectively, and the aforesaid oath of fealty before the mayor of the said city for the time being, to whom, for the time being, We give power to administer said oath: And further, for us, our heirs, and successors, We have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that they may for ever have, hold and keep within the city of Dublin, the liberties and suburbs thereof, a common market on Wednesday and Saturday in every week; and that the market commonly called Ormond Market, in Oxmantown, shall remain and continue for ever in the place called Ormond Market, saving and reserving unto John Davys, knight, his executors and administrators, his interest in the said market and in the profits thereof, in as ample manner and form as the said Sir John Davys at any time heretofore had used or enjoyed the same, any thing in these presents to the contrary notwithstanding, without impeachment or hindrance of us, our heirs or successors; and also, that the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, shall in said city and the liberties thereof, have a view of frankpledge and all things thereto belonging; and We give, grant and confirm to to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, shall have authority, from time to time, to elect such and so many fit persons (not exceeding four) to be coroners of the city and county of the city of Dublin, as to the said mayor and the rest of the common council aforesaid, for the time being, shall seem fit; and that every person and persons so as aforesaid to be nominated and elected, shall be coroner and coroners of us, our heirs and successors, of our said city and county of the city of Dublin, to continue in their said office or offices aforesaid, during the pleasure of the mayor and the rest of the common council aforesaid, for the time being, first taking the corporal oath well and faithfully to execute said office, and the other aforesaid corporal oath before the mayor of the said city of Dublin, and that the mayor of said city for the time being shall, by these presents, have power to administer said oaths: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, that there be a guild mercatory of the staple within the said city and county of the city of Dublin, consisting of one mayor and two constables, and such number of merchants of the said city and county of the said city, as to the said mayor and two constables, for the time being, shall seem fit; and that the lord mayor, aldermen and the rest of the common council of the said city, and the major part of them, may elect and choose at their will and pleasure, once and every year, from year to year, for ever, out of the said aldermen or burgesses, commons or citizens of the said city of Dublin, one mayor of the staple and two constables of the said guild mercatory of the staple in the city and county of the city of Dublin; and that the said mayor of the staple and constables, or the mayor and one of the constables of the said guild or mercatory of the staple for the time being, shall have power and authority to accept and receive recognization and recognizations of the staple debts and dues; and further, to use, do and exercise all and every thing and things, and the same to certify in our chancery, which to the office of mayor and constables, or guild mercatory do in any wise belong, according to the form and effect of the statute in that case made and provided, and in as ample manner and form as the mayor and constables in our city of Dublin, or the mayor or constables of the staple in any other city within our said kingdom of Ireland, do and use, or might and were accustomed in any wise heretofore to do and use; and that for the better government of the said staple mercatory, the mayor and constables and merchants of the staple for the time being, and their successors, in their assemblies and meetings may, from time to time, make, ordain and appoint acts, ordinances and bye-laws, and use, do and exercise all other matters which to the said mayor, constables and merchants of the guild or staple in our city of Dublin do or shall appertain, and in as ample manner and form as the mayor and constables of the staple and merchants of the guild mercatory in our city of Dublin have done and used, or were accustomed in any wise to do or use, and for us, our heirs and successors, We do nominate and appoint Sir Michael Creagh, knight, to be the modern and first mayor of the staple, and Peter Shee and Anthony Piercy, merchants, to be the first modern constables of the staple of said city, to continue in their offices until the next feast of St. Michael the Archangel; provided the said modern mayor and constables, and those who shall hereafter be mayor and constables of the said city, and each of them, take as well the corporal oath of well and truly executing their said offices, as the other aforesaid oaths before the mayor of the said city for the time being, before they shall exercise said offices, to which mayor, for the time being, We do, for us, our heirs and successors, give power to administer said oaths: And that every person hereafter to be elected mayor or constables of the staple, shall continue in that office for one year, unless in the mean time he be removed for misconduct by the common council, or the major part of them, by whom, for such cause, We will that they shall be amoveable: And further, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, for the maintenance of the said city and the public business thereof, We have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, all and singular, manors, castles, houses, edifices, tofts, bottoms, gardens, lands, tenements and hereditaments, rents, reversions, goods and chattels, and ensigns of magistracy which the mayor, sheriffs, and commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, at any time before the said judgment was made, had used or enjoyed, or ought to have held used or enjoyed, by reason or pretence of any charters, grants, letters patents, or in whatsoever other legal manner, right, custom and prescription or title the same were heretofore legally had and used; to have and to hold, all and singular the premises so granted and confirmed to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, to be held of us, our heirs and successors, by the rents and services thereout due and accustomed, and particularly for the rent of 42*l.* sterling, to be paid yearly, on the feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and St. Michael the Archangel, in equal portions, being the rent heretofore payable to our Lord the King, for the lands, tenements and customs called the Tholsol Ferries; and further, of our more ample special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, for the better support and maintenance of the said city and the magistracy thereof, and for repairing the walls, pavements, ports, bridges, wharfs and other affairs and public works of the said city, and the franchises thereof, We have given, granted, confirmed, and for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors for ever, all and every so many such the same and the like tolls, wharfage, anchorage, murage, stallage, passage, gatage, paveage, pontage and picarage, and so many such the

same

same and the like customs, petty duties, liberties, franchises, immunities, quittances, powers, authorities, privileges and jurisdictions, fairs and markets as the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, or any of them, before said judgment was made, had, held, used or enjoyed, or ought to have had held, used or enjoyed, by reason or pretence of any charters, letters patents and grants, in any wise heretofore made, confirmed or granted, or in whatsoever other legal manner, right, custom, use, prescription or title the same were heretofore legally had and used; to hold of us, our heirs and successors, by the rents and services thereout due and accustomed; saving always, out of this our charter, our grant and confirmation, and to us, our heirs and successors, excepting and reserving all title, rights, rents, services, customs, subsidies, excise, poundage, liberties and demands whatsoever, which We, before the returning of the said judgment, have had, held, occupied, used or enjoyed, or ought or might have held, occupied, enjoyed or used, within the said city of Dublin, the franchises and precincts thereof, and in or within the county of the said city of Dublin, otherwise than by reason of the discontinuation, forfeiture, or dissolution of the liberties or franchises aforesaid seized into our hands; saving, and out of this our present grant, excepting and reserving all and every jurisdiction of the Lord High Admiral of us, our heirs and successors, and all manner of privileges to the same belonging, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, and all manner of privileges to the same belonging, and by these prohibit any person or persons from the execution of all and every jurisdiction of the admiralty, by virtue, pretence, or under colour of this present grant, any thing in these presents to the contrary notwithstanding; provided that these our letters patent shall not extend to giving or granting to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, or to any of them, pension or annuity to them, or to any of them, granted by the late king Charles the Second, to be paid out of his Exchequer: And further, We will by the presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant to said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that the mayor, aldermen, and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them for the time being, shall and may, now and hereafter have power and authority to admit and make men free of the said city of Dublin, and of the several fraternities, companies and guilds within the said city and the franchises thereof, for the time being; provided said freemen and each of them take the corporal oath of freemen, and the other aforesaid oath, before the mayor of the said city of Dublin, for the time being, to which mayor, for us, our heirs and successors, We do by these presents, give and grant power to administer said oaths; provided always, and We do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, from time to time and at all times hereafter, give, preserve full power and authority to our deputy general and other chief governor or governors of us, our heirs and successors, to remove and declare to be removed from their offices, the mayor, recorder, sheriffs, or any of the aldermen, burgesses and other officers of said city by these presents named and appointed, and hereafter to be elected and appointed, at the will and pleasure of our deputy general or other chief governor or governors of us, our heirs and successors of our kingdom of Ireland, for the time being, by order of the privy council, of us, our heirs or successors of our kingdom of Ireland, by writing, under their hands respectively signified, and as often as our deputy general, or other chief governor or governors, of us, our heirs and successors, of their heirs and successors, of our said kingdom of Ireland, from time to time shall by any such order of our privy council of our said kingdom of Ireland, declare such mayor, recorder, sheriffs, or any of such aldermen, burgesses or other officers of said city, so removed from their respective offices; that then and from thenceforth every such person or persons so amoved or declared to be amoved from their respective offices, shall really and without any further process be removed, and so as often as the case shall so happen, any thing the contrary thereof notwithstanding: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do assign and nominate Simon Carrick, John Moore, George Kennedy and Edward Rose, merchants, to be the modern coroners of the city and county of the city of Dublin, to continue in their offices during the pleasure of the mayor and the rest of the common council of said city, so that they and every of them be amoveable at the pleasure of the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them; and that each of them before he shall exercise the office of coroner, shall take his oath of well and faithfully executing that office in and by all things to the said office appertaining, and the other oaths of fealty in these presents mentioned, before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, to which mayor for the time being, We do, for us, our heirs and successors, give power to administer said oaths, as well to the said coroners in these presents named, as to all and every coroner and coroners to be hereafter elected: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do ordain and decree, that the said modern mayor, and every mayor hereafter to be elected within the said city, shall be amoveable for misconduct by the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city for the time being; and that the modern sheriffs in these presents named, and the sheriffs hereafter to be elected within said city, and each of them shall be amoveable at the pleasure of the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, and the major part of them for the time being; and that the modern sheriffs, and the sheriffs to be hereafter elected within said city or county of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, shall have such the same and the like jurisdictions, powers, authorities and pre-eminences as the sheriffs for the city and county of the city of Dublin have at any time heretofore had used or enjoyed: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do appoint John Bermingham, merchant, to be the modern keeper or marshal of the prison of the said city of Dublin, commonly called the marshalsea, in the place of one Edward Harris, who was before the keeper of said prison, to hold said office, the said Bermingham during his good behaviour, with all the fees, regards and profits to the said office appertaining, and such as the marshal of the said city hath at any time heretofore had, perceived, used and enjoyed, to continue in said office during his good conduct, unless in the mean time by reason of any provision in these presents or for misconduct, he be removed by the common council of the said city, or the major part of them; provided the said John Bermingham and every other person to be elected to that office, shall take his corporal oath well and faithfully to execute said office in and by all things to the same appertaining, and the oath of fealty in these presents mentioned, before the mayor of the said city of Dublin, to whom we give power to administer said oaths: And further, we direct, for us, our heirs and successors, that if the said John Bermingham or any other person to be hereafter elected to that office, shall die or be amoved from his office, whom we will, shall be amoveable for misconduct, by the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, or the major part of them, that then it shall and may be lawful for the mayor and the rest of the common council of the said city, for the time being, to elect another discreet man out of the commons or inhabitants of said city, to be the keeper and marshal of the said prison called the Marshalsea, of the said city: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that a market shall be hereafter held in Lazy-hill, within said city and the franchises thereof, commonly called Roscommon Market, in the place there appointed and chosen by Carey Earl of Roscommon, his executors, administrators and assigns, his rights, title and interests, which he claimeth and hath under the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin; provided the market to be so held shall not injure or impede the streets there, any thing in these presents to the contrary notwithstanding. And further, We order, that it shall be lawful for the said John Bermingham during his absence, or in sickness, or for any reasonable cause, to appoint a deputy marshal or keeper of the said prison, to continue in said office during the pleasure of the said John Berminghan, provided such deputy to be from time to time made, shall be approved of and allowed by the common council of the said city, or the major part of them for the time being; and provided such deputy takes the oath of well and truly executing that office, and the oath in these presents mentioned, before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, to whom we give power to administer said oaths: Saving and reserving to James Talbot of Templeoge, in the county of Dublin, his heirs and assigns, and to every person or persons claiming or deriving by from or under him or them, all his or their rights, title and interests, of in and to the said water and watercourse, leading or coming from Templeoge alias Townloge, to the city of Dublin, and to all the rent and port corn which are or shall be from thence due, to the said Talbot, his heirs and assigns: And further, we will, declare and direct, and firmly enjoining command, for us, our heirs and successors, that the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, and every of them, shall and may have, hold, use and enjoy, all the liberties, authorities, franchises, jurisdictions, taxations, customs, duties, immunities, lands and tenements aforesaid, according to the tenour and effect of of these our letters patent, without the hindrance or impediment of us, our heirs or successors, or of the justices, sheriffs, bailiffs or other officers of us, our heirs and successors whomsoever, forbidding that the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, or any of them, shall be in anywise disturbed, molested or aggrieved by reason of the premises, or any of them, by us, or by our heirs, or by the justices, sheriffs, escheators, bailiffs, or other ministers of us, our heirs or successors whomsoever: And further for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that if any alderman to be hereafter nominated and elected to the office of mayor of the said city, shall die before he be sworn into the office of mayor, or refuse to undertake said office, or if any burgess or burgesses hereafter to be elected sheriff or sheriffs of said city, shall either die or refuse to undertake the execution of said office, that in such case it shall be lawful for the common council of the said city, or the major part of them, to elect another of the aldermen of said city, to be mayor of said city, in the place of him so deceased or so refusing that office; and to elect out of the burgesses of said borough, one or two persons to be sheriff or sheriffs of the said city, in the place of him or them so deceased or refusing, and so as often as the case shall so happen; provided such person so elected mayor shall take the several oaths aforesaid, appointed to be taken by the mayor of the said city, before the chief governor or governors of our kingdom of Ireland, for the time being, or before the chief baron of our court of Exchequer, of our said kingdom of Ireland, for the time being, or before the last mayor who had filled that office the preceding year, to whom respectively, We do, for us, our heirs and successors, give power to administer said oaths; and provided such person or persons so to be elected sheriff or sheriffs do take the several aforesaid oaths, to be taken by the sheriffs before the mayor of the said city, for the time being, to whom We give power to administer the said oaths: And further, for us, our heirs and successors, We do ordain and declare that the aforesaid oaths above-mentioned, to be taken by the mayor, sheriffs, aldermen, recorder, common councilmen, burgesses and other officers of the said city, of well and faithfully executing their respective offices as aforesaid, shall be the oaths usually and anciently taken, of well and faithfully executing their respective offices or places; and that the oath of a freeman, to be as aforesaid taken by freemen of said city, as is above appointed shall be the oath anciently used to be taken by freemen: And further, We will, and for us, our heirs and successors, do grant to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens

citizens of the city of Dublin, and their successors, that these our letters patent, or the inrolment thereof, shall be in and by all things for ever firm, valid, good, sufficient and effectual in the law against us, our heirs and successors, as well in all courts as elsewhere within our said kingdom of Ireland, notwithstanding the ill naming, or ill reciting, or not reciting the premises above, by these presents granted and confirmed, or any part thereof; and notwithstanding the not finding any office or inquisition of the premises, or any of them, by which our title ought to be found before the making of these our letters patent, and notwithstanding the ill reciting or not reciting any demise or demises, grant or grants, made of the premises, or any part thereof, being of record, or not of record, and notwithstanding the ill naming, or not truly naming, or not naming any town, hamlet, parish or place in which the premises, or any part thereof lie; and notwithstanding that of the names of the tenants, farmers or occupiers of the premises, or any part thereof, a full, true and certain mention is not made; and notwithstanding any defects in the certainty, computation and omission of the true yearly value of the premises, or any part or parcel thereof, or of the yearly rent thereout reserved; and notwithstanding that each of the franchises, liberties, customs, lands, tenements and hereditaments, and other things above granted, are not respectively expressed and mentioned in these presents, or their nature, species, quantity or quality; and notwithstanding the statute of not putting lands and tenements in mortmain; and notwithstanding a statute made at Limerick in the 33d year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth, for lands given by the King; and notwithstanding any other statute, law, provision, ordinance, restriction or other thing, cause or matter whatsoever; provided always, that these our letters patent be inrolled in the rolls of our court of Chancery, of our kingdom of Ireland, within six months after the date thereof. In witness whereof, We have caused these our letters patent. Witness our aforesaid deputy general, and general governor of our said kingdom of Ireland, at Dublin, the twenty-seventh day of October in the third year of our reign.

Domville.

Inrolled the 4th day of December, in the third year of
the reign of King James the Second.

Appendix N° 24.

GRANT of Charles the Second; the Mayor of Dublin to have a Cap of Maintenance, &c.

CHARLES the Second by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the faith, &c. To all men to whom these presents shall come, greeting: WHEREAS King Henry the Fifth did by letters patents, made the fifth day of March in the fourth year of his reign, grant and give licence, that the mayor of the city of Dublin, which then was, and his successors, should and might have a certain sword, guilded with gould, carried before them in honour of the said king and his heirs, and of his faithful leige people of the city aforesaid, in such manner as the mayor of his city of London hath the like sword carried before him; We being desirous to put a marke of our royal father upon the said city for the eminent services performed to us and to our late royal father of ever blessed memory, and by our faithful leige people of the said city; Know ye therefore, that We of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, as a marke of our royal favour to the mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, by and with the advice and consent of our right trustee and well beloved counsellor, Sir Maurice Eustace, knight, Lord Chancellor of our said kingdom of Ireland, and of our right trusty and well beloved cousins and counsellors, Roger Earl of Orrery and Charles Earl of Mountrath, our lords justices and governors of our said realme of Ireland, and according to the tenour and effect of our letters, bearing date at our court at Whitehall, the nine-and-twentieth day of September in the twelfth year of our reign, and now inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery in Ireland, have granted and licensed, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, do grant and give licence unto the said mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, by such name or names as they are incorporated, that the mayor of the said city which now is, and his successors, mayors of the said city for the time being, shall and may have a capp of maintenance worn before him and them successively, in such manner as our mayor of our said city of London hath; and also, that the said mayor of our said city of Dublin, and his successors, shall and may wear a collar of S. S. both which We have sent as a marke of our royal favour to the said mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin: And our will and pleasure is, and We do by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, that the same shall go in succession as a testimony of our good acceptance of their faithful services to us and our royal father, of ever blessed memory: And our further will and pleasure is, that these our letters patents, or the inrollment thereof, and every clause, matter and thing whatsoever herein contained, shall be good, firm, valid, sufficient and effectual in the law, unto the said mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, against us, our heirs and successors, as well in all our courts within our said realm of Ireland as elsewhere wheresoever, notwithstanding the not naming or misnaming, or not reciting or misreciting of the name or names, stile, title or additions by which

which our said city or citizens of Dublin is, or are incorporated; and notwithstanding any other defects, cause, matter or thing, whatsoever, to the contrary thereof. In witness whereof We have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness our aforesaid lords justices of our said realm of Ireland, at Dublin, the twentieth of April in the thirteenth year of our reign.

R. Wogan,
Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.

Appendix N° 25.

GRANT unto the Lord Mayor of Dublin, &c. to have a Foot Company.

CHARLES the Second, by the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith and so forth; To all men to whom these presents shall come, greeting: WHEREAS We thought fit, in testimony of our gracious acceptation of the eminent services performed unto us by our trusty and well beloved Alderman Robert Dee, late mayor of Dublin, who appeared signally instrumental in our happy restoration, during the time of his mayoralty, in our city of Dublin, in our said kingdom of Ireland, to confer upon him, the said Alderman Dee, the command of a foot company in our standing army in that our kingdom: And whereas, the whole body of the citizens of that our city did give cheerful and timely evidences of their loyalty, with those who appeared most active in our service there: And whereas, We have thereupon thought fit, not only to take special notice of the same, but also to place upon them a lasting mark of our gracious sense thereof; Know ye, therefore, that We, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our right trusty and well beloved counsellor, Sir Maurice Eustace, knight, our lord chancellor of our said kingdom of Ireland, and of our right trusty and well beloved cousin and counsellor, Roger Earl of Orrery, our lords justices and governors of our said realm of Ireland, and according to the tenor and effect of our letters, bearing date at our court at Whitehall, the one-and-twentieth day of October, in the thirteenth year of our reign, and now enrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery, in our said realm of Ireland, have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant unto the mayor of our said city of Dublin, that shall happen to be immediately after the decease of the said Alderman Robert Dee, and the successive mayors of that our city for the time being, successively, that the office, place and command of captain of the foot company, now possessed by the said Alderman Robert Dee, together with all such allowances of salary and pay as by our establishment in our said kingdom of Ireland is to be given to such captain or officer of the foot; To have and to hold the said office, place and command of captain of the said company of foot, together with all such allowances of salary and pay as by our establishment in our said kingdom of Ireland is to be given unto officer of foot, unto the mayor of our said city of Dublin that thall so happen to be immediately after the decease of the said Alderman Robert Dee, and the successive mayors of that our city for the time being successively, during the time of their mayoralty, and continuance of the said command in manner aforesaid: Provided always, and our will and pleasure is, that the said mayor that shall happen upon the death of the said Alderman Robert Dee to be in the said office, and all other the said successive mayors, be first approved of by us, or such other our governor or governors of our said kingdom of Ireland as hereafter shall be, to the persons capable of bearing the said mark of our princely favour: And to the end that this our grant may be effectual, and at all times hereafter accordingly executed and performed, our further will and pleasure is, that these our letters patents be entered amongst the Acts of Council of our said kingdom of Ireland, and in all other places where the same shall be necessary: And our further will and pleasure is, and We do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, will and continue our treasurer, vice treasurer, general receiver and treasurer at wars of our said kingdom that now is, or that at any time hereafter shall be for the time being, and every of them, and every other person or persons whatsoever to whom it shall belong, that they and every of them, upon the sight of these our letters patents, or the enrollment thereof, shall pay or cause to be paid unto the mayor of our said city of Dublin that shall happen to be immediately after the death of the said Alderman Robert Dee, and the successive mayors of our said city of Dublin for the time being, and which shall have the command of the said company of foot, all such allowances of salary and pay as by our establishment in our said kingdom of Ireland is to be given to such officer of foot as aforesaid, from and after and during so long time as such company shall stand and be under their commands severally and successively as aforesaid, at such days and times, and in such manner and form as shall be appointed by us, our heirs and successors, by our said establishment; for doing whereof, these our letters patents, or the enrollment thereof, shall be to them and every of them, sufficient warrant and discharge in that behalf. In witness whereof, We have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness our said justices of our said realm of Ireland, at Dublin, the eighth-and-twentieth day of February, in the fourteenth year of our reign.

R. Wogan,
Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.

Appendix N° 26.

GRANT of a Ferry to the City of Dublin.

CHARLES the Second by the grace of God of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the faith, &c. To all men to whom these presents shall come, greeting: Whereas We have taken into our gracious consideration the letters from our deputy and councell of our said kingdom of Ireland, directed to our right trusty and right entirely beloved cousin and counsellor, James Duke of Ormond, our lieutenant general and general governor of that our kingdom, bearing date the fifteenth day of February in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred sixty and four, and the humble desire of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our city of Dublin, in our said kingdom of Ireland, which by their petition they presented to our said deputy and councell of that our kingdom, and humbly besought them to recomend unto us, and the answer of our said deputy and councell of our said kingdom of Ireland, to those, their desires, and considering the eminent merits and services of our said city, not only in the time of the reigne of our royal father of ever glorious memory, deceased, but at the time of our happy restoration, and being informed that it is very expedient and necessary, for the common good and safety of our subjects who dwell and reside within and neere unto our said city of Dublin, and the suburbs of the same; and that it will also conduce much to the safety of the public and security of our said city, that the ferry over the river of Annaliffy should be committed to the charge and oversight of the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors; Know ye therefore, that We for the considerations aforesaid, and for divers other good causes and considerations us thereunto especially moving, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and councellor, Thomas Earl of Ossory, our deputy general of our said kingdom of Ireland, and our privy councell of the same, and according to the tenor and effect of our letters, bearing date at our court at Whitehall, the fourteenth day of March in the seventeenth year of our reign, and now inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery in our said realm of Ireland, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, the said ferry or passage over the river of Annaliffy, together with free liberty and privilege of transporting, carrying and recarrying all manner of passengers over the said water, and all fees, profits, commodities and advantages, with the fee of a halfpenny (or less, if less hath been accustomed to be taken) of every passenger that shall pass in any of the ferry boates over the said water of Annaliffy, together with free liberty and power to provide and erect one or more ferry-boat or boates, for the carrying and transporting of all and all manner of passengers to and from the said city, over the said water, and all things whatsoever necessary belonging thereunto, in as large and ample manner as any other person or persons whatsoever heretofore using the said ferry have had used occupied or enjoyed the same, To have, hold, use, exercise and enjoy the said ferry and ferries, and all fees, profits, commodities and advantages, with the fee of a halfpenny (or less, if less have been accustomed to be taken) of every passenger that shall pass in the said ferry or ferries, and all and singular other the premises unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, yielding and paying therefore unto us, our heirs and successors, at the receipt of our court of Exchequer in our said kingdom of Ireland, the just and full sum of four pounds sterling, current money of England, at the feast of Saint Michael the Archangel and Easter, by even and equal portions: The said ferry or ferries to be exercised by the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city, and their successors, or by their sufficient deputy or deputies, agent or agents, servant or servants; and our will and pleasure is, and We do by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, straitly oharge, command and require that the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, or their sufficient deputy or deputies, agent or agents, servant or servants, or some of them, do from time to time and at all times hereafter, from sun-rising and an hour before, until sun setting and an hour after, give due attendance upon the execution of the said office with sufficient boates, and all other things necessary, and belonging to the said ferry and ferries as becometh: And our further will and pleasure is, and We do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, straitly charge and command that no other person or persons do, or shall at any time hereafter exercise, keep or maintain any ferry-boat or boates, or carry over any person or persons whatsoever, for gain or hire, over the said river of Annaliffy, at any place or places between the bridge of Dublin and the Ring's End, other than the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, or such person or persons as shall from time to time be lawfully authorized under them, upon paine of our high displeasure: And further, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, and according to the tenor and effect of our said letters, We have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, that these our letters patent, or the inrollment thereof, and every clause, article, matter and thing whatsoever herein contained, shall be in by and through all things firm, good, valid, sufficient and effectual in the law unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, against us, our heirs and successors, as well in all the courts within our said kingdom of Ireland as elsewhere wheresoever, notwithstanding any defect or defects whatsoever, in matter, form or otherwise, in these presents; any statute, act ordinance, provision or restriction, or any other cause, matter or thing whatsoever to the contrary hereof, in anywise notwithstanding, although express mention be not made of the true yearly value or certainty of the premises, or of any gift or grant heretofore made by us or any of our progenitors, to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, of the premises; any statute, act, ordinance, provision or restriction, or any other cause, matter or thing whatsoever to the contrary hereof in anywise notwithstanding. In witness whereof, We have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness our aforesaid deputy general of our said kingdom of Ireland, at Dublin, the two-and-twentieth day of May in the seventeenth year of our reign.

R. Wogan,
Deputy Keeper of the Records.

Appendix Nº 27.

GRANT of Release of Quit Rents unto the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs and Commonalty, &c. of the City of Dublin; dated 21st November, 18 Charles 2.

CAROLUS Sc̃dus Dei gr̃a Anglie, Scoc̃, Franc̃, et Hibˀnie, rex fidei defensor̃ omnibȝ ad quos pˀntes ƚre ñre ꝑvenient saƚtm̃ cum nos in regiam ñram reminiscentiam accepimus ƚras a nup deputat̃ ñro genˀaƚ dicti regni ñri Hibˀnie et consilio ñro ib̃d ad pˀdilect̃ et per qᵃm fideƚ consanguiñ et consiliar̃ ñrm Jacobꝰ Duc̃ Ormonđ loc̃ tenent̃ ñrm genˀaƚ et genˀaƚ gubˀnator̃ ñrm dict̃ regni ñri Hibˀnie gerent̃ dat̃ decimo quinto die Februar̃ anno đni ñri miƚƚimo sexcentissimo sexagissimo quarto necnon humiƚ desider̃ maior̃ vic̃ comit̃ et civium civitat̃ ñre Dubliñ in dicto regno ñro Hibˀnie que ꝑ petitioñ suas dict̃ nup deputat̃ ñro et consiƚ dicti regni ñri Hibˀnie obtulere et nob̃ recom̃endare supplicaverint ac etiam respons̃ dict̃ nup deputat̃ ñri genˀaƚ et consiƚ ñri dicti regni ñri Hibˀnie ad dict̃ desider̃ sua et regiament̃ revolvent̃ qᵃmplur̃ laudabiƚ servit̃ ꝑ dict̃ civitat̃ ñram egregie navatã in imperio patris ñri regaƚ beate memorie de quib̃ȝ ipse ꝑ ƚras suas gerent̃ dat̃ apud cur̃ suam Oxoñce vicesimo t̃tio die Februar̃ anñ dñi miƚƚimo sexcentissimo quadragessim̃ tertio et tunc maior̃ recordator̃ vicecom̃ et communitat̃ dict̃ civitat̃ direct̃ speciaƚ agnoscere dignitat̃ est et in quibȝ gratiose beneplit̃ fuit inverbo regis pˀpotent̃ devovere quod tempore opptuno servit̃ dict̃ civitat̃ in honor̃ et advantag̃ eorunđ benigñ sua regaƚ remisceret̃ ac regio affectũ speculant̃ ꝑ magñ dict̃ civit̃ indigent̃ ad qᵃm ipsi ꝓpter leigeant et fidelitat̃ suam reduct̃ fuere et sub quibȝ qᵃm plur̃ anñ retro actis operose laboraverunt monument̃, aliquod et insigne gratie et favoris ñri regaƚ in dict̃ civitat̃ ñram concedere decrevimꝰ. Cumq̧ sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ et pecuniar̃ sumũ in his pˀntib̃ postea mencõẽ nob̃ ꝑ solvenđ sunt singuƚ anñ ꝑ dict̃ maior̃ vicecom̃ com̃unitat̃ et cives dict̃ civitat̃ ñre Dublin (viz.) ꝓ antique feođ firmꝰ sive reddit̃ dominicaƚ dict̃ civitat̃ Dublin annuaƚ reddit̃ aut sum̃ trigint̃ et duar̃ librar̃ sex̃ soliđ et dũ denar̃ sterƚ ac ꝓ pos̃sion nup abbat̃ vel priorat̃ omñ sanctor̃ juxta civitat̃ Dubliñ annuaƚ reddit̃ aut sum̃ trium librar̃ trium solidor̃ unius obuƚ & quadrant̃ sterƚ et ꝓ sepaƚ dom̃ et pos̃sioñ ꝑtineñ ad nup Abbathiam de Thomas Court juxta Dublin pˀdict̃ annuaƚ reddit̃ vel sum̃ trium librar̃ octo soliđ et sex̃ denar̃ sterƚ et ꝓ sepaƚ dom̃ et pos̃sioñ ante hac ꝑtineñ ad Abbathia sc̃te Marie juxta Dublin pˀdict̃ annuaƚ reddit̃ aut sum̃ vigint̃ et novem librar̃ uñ soliđ et sex denar̃ ster̃ ac etiã ꝓ custum̃ vocat̃ the Tollbott annuaƚ reddit̃ vel sum̃ septem soliđ et sex denar̃ sterƚ. Ac etiam ꝓ quod capitaƚ reddit̃ ex Theoloñ Anglice the Tollsell sum̃ đnar̃ soliđ et trium denar̃ sterƚ et ꝓ ꝑcell terr̃ vocat̃ the Pill infra mur̃ dict̃ Abbathie sc̃te Marie et aq̃m vocat̃ the Liffee annuaƚ reddit̃ aut sum̃ trigint̃ soliđ sterƚ. Qui sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ pˀdict̃ faciunt in toto annuaƚ sum̃ sexagint̃ et novem librar̃ octo decem soliđ undecem denarior̃ et obuƚ sterƚ ꝓut ꝑ qᵃm plur̃ memoranđ in cur̃ ñrar sc̃cij dicti regni ñri. Hibˀnie de recorđ remaneñ magis plane liquet et apparet, cumq̧ informamur quod pˀdict̃ sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ et pecuniar̃ sumum (sic ut pˀfertʳ) nobis debit et solubiƚ jam aretro sunt et insolut̃ ꝓ sepaƚ añus ultim̃ pˀterit̃. Et q̃d dñus maior̃ vicecomit̃ communitat̃ et cives dict̃ civitate ñre Dubliñ modo existeñ nos humiliare supplicaverint ut dict̃ sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ aut sum̃ sic aretro existeñ ijsdem dño maior̃ vice comitib̃ et civibus dict̃ civitat̃ ñre remittere et relaxare dignarañ et q̃d reducerem̃ dict̃ sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ ꝓ tempore futuro a sum̃ sexagint̃ et novem librar̃ octo decem soliđ undecem denarior̃ et obuƚ sterƚ ad sum̃ vigint̃ librar̃ sterƚ ꝑ annũ nos libere et gratiose dict̃ sũplicac̃õn suam concedere statuimꝰ. Sciatis igit̃ q̃d nos de gr̃a ñra spiãƚ ac ex certa sciã et mero motũ ñris necnon de advisament̃ et consensu pˀdilecti et ꝑ qᵃm fideƚ consanguiñ et consiliar̃ ñri Jacobi Duc̃ Ormonđ loc̃ tenent̃ ñri genˀaƚ et genˀaƚ gubˀnator ñri dicti regni ñri Hibˀnie ac justa tenor̃ et effect̃ quarunđ ƚrar̃ ñrar̃ manu ñra ꝓpria signatar̃ et sub signeto ñro datar̃ apud curiam ñram de Whitehall decimo quarto die Martij anno regni ñri decimo septimo. Et nunc in rotuƚ cur̃ ñre cancellar̃ dict̃ regni ñri Hibˀnie irrotulat̃ dedimus remissimus relaxavimꝰ acquietavimꝰ exoneravimꝰ et quiet̃ clamavimꝰ ac ꝑ pˀntes ꝓ nob̃ heređ et success̃ ñris damꝰ remittimꝰ relaxamꝰ acquietamꝰ exonˀamꝰ et quiet̃ clamavimꝰ modo dño maior̃ vicecomitˀ committatˀ et civib̃ dict̃ civitat̃ ñre Dublin et successor̃ suis imꝑpetuũ omñ et singuƚ arrearag̃ dict̃ sepaƚ annuaƚ reddit̃ trigint̃ et đnar̃ librar̃ sex soliđ et duor̃ denarior̃ sterƚ nob̃ debit et solubiƚ ex antiquo feođ firm̃ sive reddit̃ dominicaƚ dict̃ civitat̃ ñre ut pˀdict̃ est, ac etiam omñ arrearag̃ iƚƚ reddit̃ annuaƚ trium librar̃ trium soliđ obuƚ

obuł et quadrant̃ sterling p annum noƀ similit̉ debit̃ et solubił ut p̉dict̃ est ex poss̃ion̄ nuꝑ Abbathie vel priorat̃ om̄ sanctor̃ juxta Dublin̄ p̉dict̃. Ac etiam om̄ arrearag̃ annuał ilł reddit̃ trium librar̃ octo solidor̃ et sex denar̃ sterł p an̄ noƀ similit̉ debit̃ et solubił ex sepał dom̃ et poss̃ion̄ ꝑtin̄ ad Abbathẽ de Thomas Court juxta Dublin p̉dict̃ ac etiam arrearag̃ annuał illius reddit̃ vigint̃ et novem librar̃ un̄ solid et sex denar̃ sterł noƀ similit̉ debit̃ et solubił ut p̉dict̃ est ex sepał dom̃ et poss̃ion̄ ante hac ꝑtinen̄ ad Abbathiam sc̃te Marie juxta Dublin p̉dict̃ ac etiam arrearag̃ annuał illius reddit̃ septem solid et sex denar̃ ster̃ noƀ debit̃ et solubił ut p̉dict̃ est ex custum̃ vocat̃ le Tollboll p̉dict̃ ac etiam om̄ arrearag̃ annuał illius reddit̃ principał noƀ similit̉ debit̃ et solubił. Ex Theolon̄ Anglice the Thollsell p̉dict̃ ac etiam arrearag̃ annuał illius reddit̃ trigint̃ solid noƀ silit̃ debit̃ et solubił ex quadam ꝑcełł terr̃ vocat̃ the Pill scituat̃ jacen̄ et existen̄ infra mur̃ Abbathie sc̃te Marie p̉dict̃ et aquam vocat̃ the Liffee p̉dict̃ qui sepał annuał reddit̃ p̉dict̃ faciunt in toto sexagint̃ et novem litr̃ octodecem solid undecem denar̃ et obuł, et qᵃm libet inde ꝑtem vel ꝑcełł sic aretro debit̃ et insolut̃ existen̄ pro sepaliƀ an̄ retro act̃ ꝑut ꝑfert̃. Ac etiam om̄ ał arrerag̃ reddit̃ quor̃ cunqȝ noƀ debit̃ et solubił de ꝑ aut ex om̄ & singuł p̉miss̃ aut aliquiƀ eorund ante dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ geren̄ dat̃ decimo quarto die Martij anno regni n̄ri decimo septimo p̉dict̃ quomodo cunqȝ seu quandocunqȝ reddit̃ p̉dict̃ debit̃ seu reservat̃ fuere quomodocunqȝ seu quandocunqȝ noƀ vel regał patri n̄ro beate memorie p solvi debeant vel deberent. Ita q̃d neque nos hered aut successor̃ n̄ri nec aliquis ał ꝑ noƀ herediƀ vel successor̃ n̄ris aut in nōie n̄ro vel in nōie alicujus n̄ror aliquod jus tituł clameum seu demaund de ad aut p sepał annuał reddit̃ aut aliqū inde parte vel ꝑceł (sicut p̉dict̃ est) aretro et insolut̃ existen̄ ante dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ clamare seu demandare poterim̃ nec debem̃ poterint̃ nec debent̃ sed q̃d modo dn̄us maior̃ vicecom̃ cōmunitas et cives dict̃ civit̃ n̄re Dublin̄ et eor̃ successor̃ ab om̄ action̄ jur̃ tituł clam̃ et demand de aut ꝑ p̉dict̃ sepał reddit̃ et arrerag̃ eor̃ et eor̃ quoliƀt et qualiƀt ꝑt̃ earund noƀ debit̃ et solubił (ut p̉dict̃ est) et sic aretr̃ et insolut̃ existen̄ (ut p̉dict̃ est) ante dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ contra nos heredes et successor̃ n̄ros sint et erunt̃ penitus exonerat̃ et exclusi imꝑpetuū p p̉ntes. Ac ulterius de uberior̃ gr̃a n̄ra spīał ac ex c̉ta scīa et mero motu n̄ris necnon de advisament̃ et consensu p̉dict̃ ac juxta tenor̃ et effectū ŀrar n̄rar p̉d dedimꝰ et concissimꝰ ac p p̉ntes ꝑ noƀ hered et success̃ n̄ris damꝰ et concedimꝰ p̉fat̃ dn̄o maior̃ vicecomit̃ cōmunitat̃ et civiƀ civitat̃ n̄re Dublin̄ p̉dict̃ q̃d p̉dict̃ sepał annuał reddit̃ qui faciunt in toto sexagint̃ et novem litr̃ octodecem solid undec̃ denar̃ et obuł nobis heredit̃ et success̃ n̄ris debit̃ et solubił (sicut p̉dict̃ est) a die dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ gerent̃ dat̃ decimo quarto die Martij anno regni n̄ri decimo septimo supradict̃ deminentur et reducentur ad annuat sum̃ vigint̃ litrar̃ sterł p an̄ et non amplius. Ac etiam q̃d nułł al neque major̃ reddit̃ a die dat̃ ŀrar p̉dict̃ noƀ hered et successor̃ n̄ris aut aliqū ał ad usū n̄r̃m solut̃ fuerit de ex aut ꝑ p̉miss̃ p̉dict̃ aut aliqua inde ꝑte vel ꝑcełł p̉terquam reddit̃ vigint̃ litrar̃ sterł quos ad statim p p̉ntes reservamꝰ noƀ hered et successor̃ n̄ris de tempore in tempus in futuro reddend et p solvend aliquo in dict̃ prioriƀ memorand sc̃car̃ n̄ri de record remanen̄ aut in aliquiƀ ŀris patentiƀ aut alit̃ guocunqȝ modo in contrar̃ inde non obstante. Ac ulterius de uberior̃ gr̃a n̄ra spīał ac ex c̉ta scien̄ et mero motu n̄ris necnon de advisament̃ et consensu p̉dict̃ ac juxta tenor̃ et effect̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ volumꝰ ac p p̉ntes ꝑ noƀ herediƀ et successor̃ n̄ris firmit̉ ꝑcipuỉ et mandam̄ loc̃ tenent̃ n̄ro generał et gen̉al gub̉nator̃ n̄ro deputat̃ justiciar̃ et ał capitał gub̉nator̃ vel gub̉nator̃ n̄ror dict̃ regni n̄ri Hib̉nie modo existen̄ vel qui post hac ꝑ tempore existente fuerit Cancellar̃ n̄ro dicti regni n̄ri Hib̉nie ꝑ tempore existente ac vicethesaurar̃ et gen̉al receptor̃ n̄ro revention̄ n̄rar dicti regni n̄ri Hib̉nie et baronibȝ cur̃ n̄re sc̃car̃ dicti regni n̄ri Hib̉nie ac etiam ōiƀ ał officiar̃ et ministr̃ n̄ris quiƀcunqȝ dict̃ regni n̄ri Hib̉nie cui vel quiƀ spectat̃ vel spectant̃ spectabit vel spectabunt quod ipsi et eor̃ quiliƀt respective im̄ediate suꝑ visum et demonstrac̄ōn h̄ar ŀrar n̄ra patent̃ irrotulament̃ earund dict̃ dn̄i maior̃ vicecomit̃ cōmunitat̃ et cives civitat̃ n̄re Dublin̄ de et ab ōiƀ et singuł arrerag̃ p̉dict̃ et a sepał annuał reddit̃ (sic ut p̉dict̃ est) aretr̃ existen̄ ante dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ geren̄ dat̃ decimo quarto die Martij anno regni n̄ri decimo septimo exonerant̃ vel exonerari causat̃ vel causant absqȝ aliqū ał ŀri warrant̃ seu mandato a noƀ herediƀ et successor̃ n̄ris ꝑcurand impetrand seu obtinend in ea ꝑte. Et q̃d post dat̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ et de tempore in tempus imposter̃ onerant̃ vel onerat vel onerari causant̃ vel causat in et suꝑ dict̃ dn̄i maior̃ vicecom̃ cōmunitat̃ et cives civitat̃ n̄re Dublin p̉dict̃ et successor̃ suos ꝑ tempore existente ꝑ ōiƀ et singuł domiƀ terr̃ tenement̃ et hereditament̃ et ał p̉miss̃ p̉dict̃ annuał reddit̃ aut sum̃ vigint̃ litrar̃ sterł et non ampł neque aliqū ał aut major̃ reddit̃ p̉ter sum̃ vigint̃ litrar̃ sterł annuatim noƀ p solvend ex p̉miss̃ ꝑut p̉dict̃ est. Et he p̉ntes ŀre n̄re patentes erunt eis et eor̃ cuiliƀt sufficien̄s warrant̃ et exon̉ation ea ꝑte. Ac ulterius de uberior̃ gr̃a n̄ra spīał ac ex c̉ta sciā et mero motu n̄ris necnon de advisamento et consensu p̉dict̃ ac juxta tenor̃ et effect̃ ŀrar n̄rar p̉dict̃ dedimꝰ et concessimꝰ ac p p̉ntes ꝑ noƀ hered et successoriƀ n̄ris damus et concedimꝰ dict̃ dn̄o maior vicecomit̃ cōmitat̃ & civibȝ civitat̃ n̄re Dublin̄ p̉dict̃ q̃d he ŀre n̄re patentes vel irrotulant̃ earund erunt in ōiƀ et p om̄ firm̃ bone valid sufficien̄ et effectuał in lege erga et contra nos hered et successor̃ n̄ros t̃m in ōiƀ cur̃ n̄ris heredū et successor̃ n̄ror infra dict̃ regnū n̄r̃m Hib̉nie qᵃm alibi ubicunqȝ non obstante non nōiand vel non recitand ꝑticular̃ arrearag̃ vel sumꝰ sic aretr̃ existen̄ aut ꝑticular̃ nōia vel denōinac̄ōn p̉missor̃ ꝑ quiƀ reddit̃ p̉dict̃ sic aretro existit, (ut p̉dict̃ est,) vel aliqū Baron̄ comitat̃ vił villat̃ hamlet̃ lib̉tat̃ ꝑoch vel loc̃ in quo vel in quiƀ ead p̉missor̃ vel eor̃ aliqū jacent̃. Et non obstante non nōiand vel non recitand vel male nōiand vel male recitand aliqū prior̃ ŀras patent̃ vel cōn̄ssion ante hac fact̃ aut concess̃ de p̉miss̃ aut eor̃ aliqū t̃m de recordo qᵃm non de recordo existen̄. Et non obstante aliquo vel aliquiƀ defect̃ vel defect̃ in computatione vel declaration̄ veri annui valor̃ p̉missor̃ vel alicujus inde partis vel ꝑcełł. Et non obstante aliquo vel aliquiƀ defect̃ vel defect̃ in mater̃ form̃ vel alit̉ in his p̉ntiƀ ŀris n̄ris patent̉. Et non obstante aliquo statuto actu ordinac̄ōn ꝑvision̄ ꝑclamac̄ōn seu restriction̄ aut aliqua ał re causa vel mater̃

quacunq; in contrar̃ inde ꝑviso semp q̃d pꝰfat̃ dñus maior̃ vicecomit̃ communitat̃ et ciṽ civitat̃ ñre Dublin̄ pꝰdict̃ irrotulabunt seu irrotular̃ causabant has ƚras ñras patentes in alta cur̃ ñra canc̃ dict̃ regni ñri Hibʾnie infra sex menses ꝓx̃ post dat̃ har̃ ƚrar ñrar patentiñ. Eo quod expressa mentio, &c. aliqũ statuto, &c. In cujus rei testimoniũ has ƚras ñras fier̃ fecim̃ patentes teste pꝰfat̃ Jacobo Duc̃ Ormond loc̃ tent̃ ñro genʾal gubꝰnator̃ ñro dicti regni ñri Hibꝰnie apud Dublin vicesimo primo die Novembris anno regni ñri decimo octavo, irrotulat̃.

R. Wogan,
Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.

Appendix N° 28.

GRANT unto the Mayor, Sheriffs, Commons and Citizens of the City of Dublin.

CHARLES the Second by the grace of God of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting: WHEREAS the mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our city of Dublin in our kingdom of Ireland, have humbly petitioned us, thereby setting forth, that several of our subjects in that our city and kingdom being charitably affected towards such as through age, sickness, or other accidents, are reduced to poverty and disabled to gaine their living by their own labour: And piously considering also the great benefit of the good education and instruction of youth, have proposed the erection, building and establishing of an hospital and free school within the liberties of our said city of Dublin, and have showed great willingness to contribute to so good a work, which they hope to accomplish in case they may, by our royal authority, be enabled and capacitated to purchase lands, tenements and hereditaments for the erecting and maintaining of such an hospital and free school, and to make good, wholesome and necessary laws for the rule and government thereof: Know ye, therefore, that We, of our princely disposition for the furtherance and accomplishment of so good and charitable a work, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our right trusty and right well beloved counsellor, John Lord Berkeley, our lieutenant general and general governor of our said realm of Ireland, and according to the tenor and effect of our letters, bearing date at our court at Whitehall, the twenty-fourth day of October in the three-and-twentieth year of our reign, and now inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery in our said realm of Ireland, have given, granted, released and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant, release and confirm unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, all that piece or parcel of ground on Oxmon-town Green, near our said city of Dublin, on which the intended hospital and free school is already began to be built, and all and singular the edifices and buildings thereon, and all yards, backsides, lands, tenements, ways, waters, watercourses, easements, liberties, privileges, profits, commodities, advantages, appurtenances and hereditaments whatsoever to the same belonging or appertaining, of what quantity, quality, nature, kind, or sorte soever they be, and by whatsoever name or names the same are called or known, or reputed, accepted, or taken, together with their and every of their rights, members and appurtenances whatsoever, and also the reversion and reversions, remainder and remainders of all and singular the premises, and every part and parcel thereof; and also all the estate, right, title, interest, claim, property, challenge, and demand whatsoever, which we, our heirs or successors have, or at any time hereafter may, can, might, or ought to have, of, in, or unto the premises, or unto any part or parcel thereof; To have and to hold all and singular the premises before in and by these presents given, granted, released and confirmed, or herein or hereby meant, mentioned or intended to be given, granted, released and confirmed, and every part, parcel and member thereof, together with their and every of their rights, members and appurtenances whatsoever unto them the said mayor, sheriffs and citizens of our city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, to be held and enjoyed by the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, to the only use, ends, intents and purposes hereafter in these presents mentioned and expressed, that is to say, upon the special trust and confidence, and to the end, intent, and purpose that the said piece of ground on Oxmon-town Green aforesaid hereby granted, or meant, mentioned and intended to be granted, and the buildings thereon erected and to be erected, shall for evermore hereafter be, remain and continue a mansion house and place of abode for the sustentation and relief of poor children, aged and impotent people, to be holden of us, our heirs and successors, as of our castle of Dublin, in free and common soccage, without any rent or other payment to be rendered or paid unto us, our heirs and successors for the same: And further, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, and princely disposition, for the furtherance and accomplishment of so good and charitable a worke, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, and in pursuance of our said letters, We have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, full power and authority at their wills and pleasures, from time to time, and at all times, to place therein such master or masters of the said hospital, and such numbers of poor people and children, and such officers or ministers of the said hospital and free school, as likewise an able, learned, pious and orthodox minister, to be approved of from time to time by the Archbishop of Dublin for the time being, the said minister

minister to read divine service, and preach and teach the word of God to such as shall reside within the same, and catechise such children as shall be in the said hospital or free school as to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, or such as shall be appointed as aforesaid shall seem convenient, and from time to time, as they shall see occasion, to remove, displace and amove such master, minister, poore, poore children, people, or any other officers or ministers to the said hospital or free school belonging, and put some other or others in his or their place or stead, and to apportion, appoint and allow, from time to time, such fees, salaries and wages, and such allowances for maintenance, sustentation and relief of the said preacher, master or masters, other officers or ministers, and the said poor people and children as to them the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, shall seem meet: And that it shall and may be lawful to and for the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, from time to time and at all times hereafter, when and as often as it shall seem expedient or necessary, shall require to make, constitute and appoint all or any such apt, wholesome and honest ordinances, statutes, rules and orders of or in relation to the well governing of the said hospital and free school, or either of them, or the master, minister, poore, poore children, or any other officers or ministers to the said hospital or free school belonging, or to be belonging, as to them the said ministers, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, shall seem meet, convenient or necessary, giving and hereby granting unto them the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, full and absolute power and authority to perform and execute all act or acts, thing or things whatsoever, that shall be requisite and necessary to be done for the putting in execution or compelling a performance of all such ordinance, statutes, rules and orders that shall, by virtue of these presents been made, constituted or appointed, without interruption of us, our heirs or successors, or any of the justices, escheators, sheriffs, ministers, servants or other subjects whatsoever of us, our heirs or successors; any statute, act, law or direction heretofore done or made, or hereafter to be done or made to the contrary notwithstanding; so that such statutes, ordinances, rules or orders, so to be made, constituted or appointed, by virtue of these presents, be not contrary or disagreeing to the laws and statutes of this our kingdom of England or Ireland, or our royal authority; and such rules, ordinances and statutes to disannul and make void, as shall by the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens be found, from time to time prejudicial and hurtful to the government of the said hospital and free school: And further, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, mere motion and princely disposition, for the furtherance and accomplishment of so good and charitable a worke, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, and in pursuance of our said letters, We have also given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, that the said hospital and free school shall be named, incorporated and called, the Hospital and Free School of King Charles the Second, Dublin, and by that name shall be and is hereby erected, founded, established and confirmed, and to have maintenance and continuance for ever, and that the mayors, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, shall be from time to time governors of the said hospital and free school, and of the lands and tenements, possessions, revenues and goods unto the same belonging, or to be belonging, and shall be called and known by the name of the Governors of Hospital and Free School of King Charles the Second, Dublin: And that the said governors shall be and for ever continue by the name of the governors of the hospital and free school of King Charles the Second, Dublin, a body politic and corporate to have succession for ever, and by that name shall be and continue, and shall be able and capable in law, from time to time, and at all times for ever, to sue or be sued in any of our courts, spiritual and temporal, within our kingdom of Ireland, or other our kingdoms and dominions, in relation to the said hospital or free school, or any the lands, tenements, possessions, revenues or goods unto the same belonging, or to be belonging, or for any transgressions, offences, matters, causes or things made, committed or done, in or upon the premises or any part thereof, or any thing in these presents specified; and to purchase, take, hold, receive and enjoy, to them and their successors for ever, to the ends aforesaid, as well goods and chattels as also any manors, lands, tenements, rents, reversions, annuities and hereditaments whatsoever, as well from us, our heirs and successors, as of any other person or persons whatsoever, not exceeding the yearly value of six thousand pounds sterling, the statutes of Mortmaine or any other statutes to the contrary notwithstanding: And further, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, mere motion and princely disposition, for the furtherance and accomplishment of so good and charitable a worke, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, and in pursuance of our said letters, We have also given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant free liberty and licence, that the said governors and their successors may have and enjoy a common seal, to be used for the sealing of any instrument or instruments, deeds or writings, touching and concerning the lands, tenements and hereditaments, businesses or affairs of the said hospital and free school; nevertheless, our royal pleasure, intent and meaning is, that the said governors or their successors shall not do or suffer to be done, at any time hereafter, any act or thing whereby any the lands, tenements or hereditaments, or the state which shall belong to the said corporation shall be conveyed, alienated or transferred to any other use whatsoever than to the use of the said hospital or free school; and that the said governors, for the time being, shall not make any other lease or leases of any the lands, tenements, possessions or hereditaments which shall belong to the said corporation then for the term of forty-one years, of houses or buildings, or ground to be built on, and of one-and-twenty years of lands, tythes or other hereditaments, and those to be made, either in possession, or or not, above two years before the expiration of the state in possession, and that without fine or income, at the best yearly rent that *bonâ fide* from good and solvent tenants may be had, and that no lease be made to any of the aforesaid governors, or to any other person or persons, to the use of or in trust for any the said governors: And further, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, and in pursuance of our said letters, We have given, granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give and grant unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our city of Dublin, and their successors, that these our letters patents, or the inrollment, and every clause, article, matter and thing whatsoever herein contained, shall be, in, by and through all things, firm, good, valid, sufficient and effectual in the law, unto them the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, against us, our heirs and successors, as well in all our courts within our said realm of Ireland as elsewhere wheresoever, notwithstanding the not finding or not returning, or ill finding or ill returning of any office or inquisition of the parcel of ground and premises in and by these our letters patents meant, mentioned and intended to be given and granted for the ends and purposes aforesaid, whereby our title should have been found of, in and unto the said premises, and every part and parcel thereof, before the making of these presents; and notwithstanding the not naming, or not rightly naming of the premises, or any part or parcel thereof, or the parish, warde, liberty, freedom or place in which the premises, or any part or parcel thereof is, are or do lye; and notwithstanding the not naming, or not rightly naming the quantity, quality, nature, kind or sort of the premises, or any part or parcel thereof; and notwithstanding that of the true annual value, rate, survey, quantity or quality of the premises, there be no true, certain, or no mention made in these presents; and notwithstanding the not naming or not reciting, or ill naming or ill reciting of any grant or grants, lease or leases heretofore made of the premises, or any part or parcel thereof, to any person or persons whatsoever, for term of life, lives or years, or in fee simple, or fee tayle, or otherwise howsoever, remaining of record or not of record; and notwithstanding, that of the rents heretofore reserved upon any former demise or demises, lease or leases heretofore made of the premises, or any part or parcel thereof, there be no full, true or certain, or no mention or at all made in these presents; and notwithstanding a certain statute made in the Parliament held at Westminster, in our said kingdom of England, in the eighteenth year of the reign of King Henry the Sixth, late King of England, our predecessor; and notwithstanding a certain statute made at the Parliament held at Limerick in our said kingdom of Ireland, in the thirtieth year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth, late King of England, our predecessor, the title of which Act is, An Act for Lands given by the King; and notwithstanding any other statute or act made in our said kingdom of Ireland, in any of the years of the reign of the said King Henry the Eighth; and notwithstanding a certain statute made in our said kingdom of Ireland, in the second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, late Queen of England, our predecessor; and notwithstanding any other statute or act, statutes or acts made in our said kingdom of Ireland, in the said second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, or of any other year of the reign of the said Queen Elizabeth, or of any other the kings or queens of England; and notwithstanding any act, clause, provision or ordinance made in the Parliament began at Dublin, in the fifteenth year of the reign of our late royal father, of ever glorious memory, deceased; and notwithstanding any other statute, act, ordinance, provision or restriction, or any other cause, matter or thing whatsoever, to the evacuation or annihilation of these our letters patents; and notwithstanding that a writ of *ad quod dampnum* hath not issued to inquire concerning the premises; and notwithstanding our further will and pleasure is, and We do by these our presents, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, and their successors, that they the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, shall have these our letters patents under our great seal of Ireland, without fyne, great or small, to be therefore paid to our use in our hanaper, in our said kingdom of Ireland, although express mention is not made of the clear yearly value, or of the certainty of the premises, or that any gift or grant heretofore made by us or our progenitors to the said mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin of the premises; any statute, act, ordinance or provision, or any other cause or matter whatsoever, to the contrary notwithstanding: Provided always, that these our letters be inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery, in our said kingdom of Ireland, within the space of six months next ensuing the date of these presents. In witness whereof, We have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness our aforesaid lieutenant general and general governor of our said kingdom of Ireland, at Dublin, the fifth day of December, in the three-and-twentieth year of our raigne.

Irrot̃ vicesimo septimo die Januarii anno RRs. Caroli Sc̃di vicesimo tertio.

Appendix N° 29.

KING's Letter, granting Five Hundred Pounds per Annum unto the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, &c. of the City of Dublin.

Charles R.

RIGHT trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor, We greet you well. WHEREAS by the present establishment of that our kingdom of Ireland, the yearly sum of three thousand one hundred and thirty-five pounds, seven shillings and ninepence, as reserved, to be paid to such use or uses, or to such person or persons, without account, as We shall from time to time appoint by warrant under our signe manual, We taking into our princely consideration the constant loyalty of our good and ancient city of Dublin, do thinke fitt as a mark of our grace and favour toward them, to grant and allow the yearly sum of five hundred pounds sterling, for the better support of the lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city, which our will and pleasure is, shall be paid them half yearly by even and equal portions, out of the said sum of three thousand one hundred and thirty-five pounds, seven shillings and nine pence, so to us reserved; the first payment to be on the twenty-ninth of September next ensuing the date hereof; We do therefore will and require you forthwith to give your orders for the executing of the said allowance in the present establishment of that our kingdom, particularly mentioning the same to be paid out of the aforesaid fund; and for so doing these our letters shall be, as well unto you as unto the commissioners of our treasury and the commissioners of our accompt, and all other our officers and ministers whom it doth or may concern, a sufficient warrant and discharge. Given at our court at Whitehall the seventeenth day of September one thousand six hundred seventy-two, in the four-and-twentyeth year of our reign. By His Majesty's command. *Arlington.*

To our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor, Arthur Earl of Essex, our Lieutenant General and General Governor of our Kingdom of Ireland.

R. Wogan,
Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.

Appendix N° 30.

GRANT of Customs to Lord Mayor, Commons and Citizens of the City of Dublin.

CHARLES the Second by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, &c. To all whom these presents shall come, greeting: WHEREAS the lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of Dublin, by their petition, have humbly informed us, that several of our royal predecessors, kings and queens of England, have been graciously pleased for the portage, murage and paveage of the said city, to grant unto them several charters for the receiving and taking the island customs, commonly called the customs of the gates, for such things as are brought into the said city, and suburbs thereof, there to be exposed to sale, and for such things as are carried out of the said city, of the validity of which charters some doubts have lately arisen, and the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of our said city of Dublin, have therefore humbly besought us, that we would be graciously pleased, by a new charter to grant and confirm to them and their successors for ever, the having, receiving and taking the said customs: And whereas We having referred the consideration of the said matter to our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor Arthur Earl of Essex, our lieutenant general and general governor of our kingdom of Ireland, to report to us what he should think fit to be done thereupon; in obedience whereunto, our said lieutenant by his report, bearing date the twentieth day of March in the year one thousand six hundred seventy-five, signified to us his opinion, that he had considered of the said petition, and did conceive it necessary for our service, that We should grant our royal letters, requiring our lord lieutenant or other chief governor or governors of Ireland for the time being, to cause effectual letters patents to be passed under the great seal of our said kingdom of Ireland, containing our grant and confirmation unto the petitioners, for the having, receiving and taking the said customs to them and their successors for ever, in as large and ample manner as they have been formerly granted to them by any other charters, letters patents, from us and our royal predecessors, and have by them been enjoyed accordingly by virtue of the same; and that it would be also for our service if We should so think fit, that a provisoe should be inserted in the said letters patents, that the profits of the said customs for the term of seven years, should be disposed to such public uses for the benefit of the said corporation, as our lieutenant or other chief governor or governors and council for the time being, should think fit to direct and appoint: And whereas We were also pleased to refer the said petition and report to our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor Thomas Earl of Danby, our high treasurer of England, who fully agreed therewith; Know ye therefore, That We taking the premises into our princely consideration, and being graciously pleased to place some marke of our favour upon the said city, for their past loyalty and services to us and our royal predecessors, and also the better to encourage and enable them to perform the same for the future, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our said right trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor, Arthur Earl of Essex, our lieutenant general and general governor of our said kingdom of Ireland, and according to the tenour of our letters, under our privy signet and signe manual, bearing date at our court at Newmarket, the sixth day of April in the eight-and-twentieth year of our reign, and in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred seventy-six, now inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery in our said kingdom of Ireland, have given, granted, released and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, We do give, grant, release and confirm to the lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, all those customs, commonly called the customs of the gates, for such things as are or at any time hereafter shall be brought into the said city of Dublin, or suburbs thereof, there to be exposed to sale; and also

also for such things as are or shall be carried out of the said city, together with full liberty lycence, power and authority, to have, receive, collect and take the same, in as large and ample manner as the same have been granted to them or their predecessors, by any other charter or letters patents, from us, or any of our royal predecessors, and have been by them enjoyed accordingly by virtue of the same; To have and to hold the aforesaid customes, together with their rights, members, perquisites and appurtenances thereunto belonging, to the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors for ever, to the only use, benefit and advantage of them the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city for ever; the said customs to be received and collected by them, their agents and servants, without rendering any manner of account to us, our heirs or successors, of or for the same: Provided always, and our will and pleasure is, that the profits of the said customs for the term of seven years from the date of these our letters patents, shall be disposed of to such public uses for the benefit of the said corporation, as our lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors and councell of the said kingdom of Ireland have thought fit, or hereafter shall think fit to direct and appoint: And further, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, We do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, grant unto the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens of the said city of Dublin, and their successors, that these our letters patents, and every clause, sentence and article therein contained, or the inrollment thereof, shall be firm, good, valid, sufficient and effectual in the law, unto them the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, and their successors, against us, our heirs and successors, according to the tenour of these presents, as well in all our courts within our said realm of Ireland, as elsewhere wheresoever, without any other or further grant, release or confirmation from us, our heirs or successors, by the said lord mayor, sheriffs, commons and citizens, or their successors, to be had, procured or obtained; any law, statute, act, charter, provision or restriction, or any other clause, matter or defect whatsoever, to the enervation, evacuation or annihilation of these our letters patents notwithstanding; provided always, that these our letters patent be inrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery, in our said kingdom of Ireland, within the space of six months next ensuing the date of these presents, although, &c. In witness whereof, We have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness our aforesaid lieutenant general and general governor of our said kingdom of Ireland, at Dublin, the fourth day of September in the eight-and twentieth year of our reigne.

Irrot̃ vicesimo octavo die Februarij anno RR. Caroli Sc̃di vicesimo nono.

R. Wogan.
Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.